

1039
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

9/14
F76/2
Am 3/4
Y4
.F 76/2
Am 3/4
GOVERNMENT
Storage
AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR FREE
LABOR DEVELOPMENT

HEARING
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE
NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

WITH
GEORGE MEANY, PRESIDENT, AFL-CIO

AUGUST 1, 1969



Printed for the use of the
Committee on Foreign Relations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1969

AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR FREE
LABOR DEVELOPMENT

HEARING

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas, *Chairman*

JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama

MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana

ALBERT GORE, Tennessee

FRANK CHURCH, Idaho

STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri

THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island

GALE W. MCGEE, Wyoming

GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota

CLIFFORD P. CASE, New Jersey

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Kentucky

JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Delaware

JACOB K. JAVITS, New York

CARL MARCY, *Chief of Staff*

ARTHUR M. KUHLMAN, *Chief Clerk*

(II)

CONTENTS

	Page
Statement by George Meany, president, AFL-CIO-----	1
Insertions for the record:	
Reply to committee print of Dockery report, analysis and comment--	10
Correspondence between Mr. Meany and former Senator Wayne Morse, August 5, 21, and 27, 1968-----	17
Text of statement by the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, Chicago, Ill., May 19, 1954-----	20
List of corporate, foundation, and individual contributors to the American Institute for Free Labor Development, 1962-68-----	21
Article entitled, "AID Funds for CIA Projects," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, April 13, 1969-----	24
Article entitled, "Channel to Overseas Labor," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, April 14, 1969-----	26
Article entitled, "Labor's New Weapon for Democracy," reprint from the Reader's Digest, October 1966-----	30
List of members of Labor Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance attending 20th meeting, January 8, 1968-----	35
Excerpt from audit of U.S. AID mission to Uruguay office of the Comptroller, September 6, 1968-----	56
Article entitled, "Labor and Government Cooperate on Foreign Policy," from the Washington Post, April 28, 1969-----	74
Article entitled, "Unions Turn to AID After CIA Pullout," from the Washington Post, April 21, 1969-----	77
Chart showing American Institute for Free Labor Development Financial Statement, 1962-69-----	84
Article entitled, "Labor and State: Marriage of Convenience—What's Good for Latin America," from the Nation, January 13, 1969-----	85
Article entitled, "U.S. Labor's Conservative Role in Latin America," from the Progressive, November 1967-----	87
Article entitled, "Dubious Role of AFL-CIO—Meddling in Latin America," from the Nation, February 10, 1964-----	92
Article entitled, "Lovestone, Meany & State—American Labor Overseas," from the Nation, January 16, 1967-----	98
Article entitled, "Latin America IV—Labor Between Bread and Revolution," from the Nation, September 19, 1966-----	103
Article entitled, "American Labor Abroad—Lovestone Diplomacy," from the Nation, July 5, 1965-----	106
Article entitled, "The AFL-CIO Has Its Own CIA—Lovestone's Cold War," from the New Republic, June 25, 1966-----	117
Article entitled, "Labor's Establishment—Stop the World," from the Commonweal, March 21, 1969-----	124

AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR FREE LABOR DEVELOPMENT

FRIDAY, AUGUST 1, 1969

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to recess, at 10:05 a.m., in room 4221, New Senate Office Building, Senator J. W. Fulbright (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Fulbright, Sparkman, Church, Symington, Dodd, McGee, and Case.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. The committee is meeting this morning to hear Mr. George Meany who requested an opportunity to testify on the labor program financed by the Agency for International Development.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR FREE LABOR DEVELOPMENT

Since 1962, the American Institute for Free Labor Development, which is under the direction of the AFL-CIO, has received a little over \$28 million in foreign aid funds for its operations in Latin America. Similar AFL-CIO-directed institutes have been established for work on a more modest scale in Asia and Africa. Members of the committee will be interested in having an explanation of the purposes of this program, how it operates, and how it relates to the overall objectives of our foreign policy.

Mr. Meany, will you come forward please, sir?

Mr. MEANY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have a prepared statement, Mr. Meany?

Mr. MEANY. Yes, I have, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you proceed, sir?

STATEMENT OF GEORGE MEANY, PRESIDENT, AFL-CIO

Mr. MEANY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation for this opportunity to appear before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to clarify the role of the AFL-CIO internationally. I also appear to describe the work of the American Institute for Free Labor Development in Latin America, since its effectiveness was challenged at a hearing of this committee on July 14, 1969, according to UPI press reports published throughout the United States and Latin America which I quote:

Chairman J. William Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee suggested today that funds for an AFL-CIO labor institute in Latin America had been the price we paid for President George Meany's support of the U.S. Policy in Vietnam.

Fulbright said he hoped the Nixon Administration would review the program, for which U.S. Government auditors could find "no specific conclusions on the relative success."

Aid Administrator John A. Hannah said he would look into it.

Fulbright said the program had involved close to \$20 million since its inception. It included Alliance for Progress funds channeled into the American Institute for Free Labor Development with the stated purpose of strengthening the democratic trade union leadership in Latin America.

The new aid bill contains \$1 million for the Institute during the coming year. It is administered by the AFL-CIO.

"I have wondered if this represented the price we paid for Mr. Meany's support in Vietnam," Fulbright said. "He was a stalwart supporter of the previous Administration policies, but I should not think the new Administration would feel indebted to him."

GAO LETTER ON AIFLD WORK IN LATIN AMERICA

That is the end of the quote from UPI. On that occasion Secretary of State Rogers was asked a question by the Chairman concerning funds allocated to the AIFLD under its contract with the Agency for International Development. He said, "Is this the price we pay them to support us in Vietnam?" According to the transcript of the committee hearing at that session, the Chairman also quoted from a letter dated May 20, 1968, addressed to him, signed by Mr. Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General of the United States, which he read as follows, and I quote from the record of the hearing:

We were not able during our review to reach any specific conclusion on the relative success of the institute as an instrument for achieving U.S. foreign policy objectives in the labor sector . . .

Based upon this sentence from the Staats' letter and two newspaper articles which he subsequently inserted into the record, the Chairman concluded that there is "considerable doubt about the effectiveness" of the AIFLD work in Latin America. Further, according to the transcript, the Chairman indicated that in a number of countries the AIFLD labor institutes have been closed down by the host country for meddling in internal politics.

It is interesting to note that Chairman Fulbright read only the opening sentence of a paragraph from the Staats' letter that attempted to evaluate the work of the institute.

I would like to read into the record the full evaluation, the complete paragraph of GAO Comptroller Staats' letter from which that sentence was taken, and I now quote the full paragraph:

. . . We were not able during our review to reach any specific conclusion on the relative success of the institute as an instrument for achieving U.S. foreign policy objectives in the labor sector. *We agree that* (emphasis mine) the institute represents a realistic and imaginative approach to some of the major problems of the Western Hemisphere. For example, it provides a means whereby the workers of Latin America can participate in the Alliance for Progress and become more active in the economic and social progress of their countries . . .

That is the end of the paragraph of the Staats' letter.

To us, it is most incomprehensible that the Chairman of this committee in effect took a sentence out of context from a paragraph in the GAO letter which was obviously intended to be quite complimen-

tary of the AIFLD, giving it credit for having "a realistic and imaginative approach" and "providing a means whereby the workers can participate in the Alliance for Progress."

AIFLD HAS NEVER BEEN CLOSED DOWN

As to the statement that some in-country institutes had been closed down by the host countries, I wish to state very clearly and simply that this is not true. The AIFLD has never been closed down in any country anywhere. I state categorically that the AIFLD, which is now operating in more than 20 countries and territories in the Western Hemisphere, has been specifically invited by the workers in the trade union movement in each of these countries. We are proud of our long-standing fraternal relationships with these workers.

The AFL-CIO has always insisted on a deep sense of fiscal responsibility and we except and welcome the continued scrutiny by the General Accounting Office and the Agency for International Development. This is as it should be especially because we are aware that we are using public funds under contract. Our policy has always been one of complete and total cooperation with both of these agencies of Government. Moreover, I want to assure each and every member of this committee that we welcome criticism. We are learning as we go on with our work in this comparatively new field. But we do not equate unfounded and carping accusations with constructive criticism.

We are thoroughly familiar with the report made by the GAO to this committee in May 1968, which was included in a committee print of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs entitled "Survey of the Alliance for Progress Labor Policies and Programs."

DOCKERY REPORT

We were assured by Senator Wayne Morse, the then chairman of the subcommittee, that this report, prepared by a Mr. Robert H. Dockery, was still only a staff report despite the fact that it appeared in committee print. We did notice, of course, the disclaimer in the introduction to the report which stated that it did not express the official view of the subcommittee. Nevertheless, it was released to the public, picked up by unfriendly news media throughout the world and made to appear as an attack by the Senate Subcommittee on the AIFLD.

In a letter of August 5, 1968, to Senator Morse, I stated that the AIFLD has submitted a memorandum concerning the GAO report, which you will find on page 80 of the committee print. I also pointed out that the subcommittee report "contains quite a number of inaccuracies," that the author made little attempt to make a balanced assessment" and further that "the document reflects preconceived and biased viewpoints without any foundation in fact."

In view of the unfounded assertions and conclusions of that report, we had requested that the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs issue as a committee print my letter of August 5, 1968, to Senator Morse, which included the AIFLD analysis of the Dockery report and also to include in such committee print the AIFLD response to an extensive subcommittee questionnaire regarding AIFLD activi-

ties dated July 25, 1967. Since Communist and other extremist elements throughout the world continue to utilize this biased antilabor report of the subcommittee as part of their incessant propaganda against the efforts of our country to improve the lot of the working man under the Alliance for Progress, we reiterate at this time this request. I am sure this committee in the interest of fairness will honor our request that our reply be issued as a committee print.

AGREEMENT WITH SENATOR MORSE

We had an agreement with Senator Morse that, soon after the elections last November, a special meeting of the subcommittee would be held, giving us the opportunity to set forth our viewpoints regarding the Dockery report. However, the subcommittee hearing was never held because the Senator became involved in a vote recount in Oregon and other matters. Nevertheless, the Senator was kind enough to include our answers in the Congressional Record.

At this point, I would like to submit our replies to the aforementioned subcommittee questionnaire of July 25, 1967, my letter to Senator Morse of August 5, 1968, in which Senator Morse agreed to schedule a public hearing by the subcommittee in which myself and other spokesmen of the AFL-CIO could present their views to the subcommittee. This public hearing, promised by Senator Morse on this matter, has not been held to date.

Mr. Chairman, could I present these replies?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MEANY. I would like to point out that the reply is really a summary of what is in these two books. This is the Dockery questionnaire, and our answers to the Dockery questionnaire, and these are the backup papers to those answers to the Dockery questionnaire, going through every phase of our work both in the educational field and in the social projects field, and you have this, this has been given to Mr. Dockery, I believe, but this is what I am presenting now, a summary of what is in these papers.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you mean the summary would be included?

Mr. MEANY. Yes, and the Morse correspondence.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Morse letters; yes, sir. (See page 10.)

LABOR MOVEMENT ATTITUDE TOWARD VIETNAM SITUATION

Mr. MEANY. It is a gratuitous insult to the American labor movement to accuse us of receiving a payoff for supporting the foreign policy of any administration. We are indeed proud of our support of the U.S. Government during World War II, during the Korean War and during the war that is now taking place in Vietnam. Our official attitude regarding Vietnam was first made known in a resolution which was adopted by the then American Federation of Labor executive council as long ago as May 1954. I ask that a copy of this resolution be placed in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. MEANY. Then, as now, our solution to the Vietnam situation called for a peaceful settlement through free elections. We further proposed to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the admin-

istration in 1954 that the following measures, amongst others, be adopted; (1) That there should be a special session of the United Nations General Assembly mobilizing world support for ending the war in Indochina, safeguarding its national independence and territorial integrity and helping in its reconstruction; (2) that the special session of the U.N. General Assembly should insist on the full application of the principle of free elections in Indochina; and (3) that within the provisions of the U.N. Charter a regional defense organization should be established to build a Pacific Alliance for Peace and Freedom.

It is my opinion that the fundamental issues of national independence and territorial integrity are as valid today as in 1954.

INVOLVEMENT WITH LATIN AMERICA

Our involvement with Latin America stems from 1916 when the American Federation of Labor joined with Latin America labor leaders to found the Pan American Federation of Labor. After World War II we expanded significantly our activities throughout the world, including Latin America where we helped to establish the first Inter-American Conference of Workers. In 1951 we also helped to establish the Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers which exists actively to this day, and is known as the ORIT.

In August 1960, when we came to a full realization as to what happened to the Cuban workers and the entire Cuban people under Castro, the AFL-CIO appropriated \$20,000 for the purpose of making a feasibility study of the establishment of a mechanism through which we could help to strengthen the free labor unions of Latin America and develop trade union leadership. This led to the creation of the AIFLD, during the Eisenhower administration and before the establishment of the Alliance for Progress.

We did not then and do not want our Latin American trade union brothers to pattern their unions after our organizations in the United States.

We do expect and hope, however, that they will build unions which are strong, independent, representative of the workers and capable, through their own efforts, of improving the conditions of the workers, and making a contribution to the economic development of their own countries.

Throughout the years we had always wanted to see Latin American trade unionists and workers build a more effective labor movement. We hoped we could assist them to make significant contributions of their own to the economic and social development of their own countries.

AFL-CIO INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Now, you might ask, "Why do we have this interest? Why should American unions have an interest in the situations in Latin America, in the workers of Latin America?"

The AFL-CIO has always had an interest in workers in every part of the world. That is fraternal solidarity, humanitarianism in the best sense of the word. We have a stake in the freedom of workers everywhere. We have learned from experience that when workers

in other countries lose their freedom, where they are forced to submit to the yoke of a dictatorship or tyrannical government of any kind, their repression and enslavement constitute a grave threat to our own freedom. And of course, we have learned from the history of recent years that the very first to lose their freedoms in these circumstances are the workers. For these reasons the AFL-CIO international activities have always been extensive so that in addition to the AIFLD in Latin America, we sponsor institutes conducting a broad range of similar assistance in Africa and Asia. I would like to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that we are not looking for or trying to recruit members for the AFL-CIO in any country of any of these continents.

In view of our extensive international activities, on which we spend about 20 percent of our income, it was only natural when we looked at Latin America, our closest neighbors in the trade union field, we felt that we had a responsibility as workers to workers—yes; a great humanitarian responsibility—to be of help. We also felt, as American citizens, that it was certainly in the interest of our country that free governments be achieved and maintained in the Western Hemisphere. Now I'm not going to tell you that we have never made mistakes nor that we have performed miracles. Latin America still has its great problems. For example, there is still too much money being spent for unnecessary military hardware in many countries and too little being spent on the welfare of the people. But we are trying to make a contribution to help the working people of these lands play a constructive role in building democratic societies through free trade unions.

ASSISTANCE OF AMERICAN BUSINESS SOUGHT

The AFL-CIO Executive Council decided unanimously that we should bring enlightened American business into this institution on the theory that they should also have an interest in developing a friendly attitude toward the building of free societies in Latin America. They naturally want to do business there, and they certainly want to do business with countries that have viable economies. We feel that you cannot have a viable economy unless you have the positive participation of all segments of the society, especially the workers who are the most important element of production and consumption. So we went to American business, and we told them why we thought they should cooperate. We got a most encouraging response.

The result is that we have some outstanding American businessmen contributing to the work of the AIFLD including Peter Grace, Chairman of the AIFLD, who is president of the W. R. Grace Co.; Mr. William Hickey, president of the United Corp.; Mr. U. W. Balgooyen, director of EBASCO Industries; Mr. Brent Friele, senior vice president, American International Association for Economic and Social Development; Mr. Juan Trippe, founder and for many years head of Pan American airways; Mr. Henry Woodbridge of the True Temper Corp., among others. We have several outstanding businessmen sitting on the board of trustees, headed by our chairman, J. Peter Grace. It should be noted that in going to these businessmen, we told them quite frankly what we wanted to do; namely, to help strengthen free trade unions in Latin America.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF CORPORATIONS AND BUSINESSMEN TO AIFLD

At this point I would like to submit for the record a list of the American corporations and individual businessmen who have contributed to the AIFLD. This list contains approximately 50 or 60 names and it includes practically every large corporation in America. Can I submit that, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it will be received. (See p. 21.)

Mr. MEANY. The AFL-CIO feels that in our democratic society the voluntary organizations have a great role to play in influencing and molding the foreign relations of our country. This is our responsibility as citizens and trade unionists. While we welcome and appreciate the assistance AIFLD has received from our Government through the AID in order to carry out our programs, we would also like to point out that contributions in excess of \$2,300,000 have been made to our work in Latin America from the AFL-CIO, and the corporations I have listed, submitted. In addition, the AFL-CIO and U.S. private investors have themselves committed \$31 million for low-cost worker housing sponsored by AIFLD.

ACTUAL WORK OF THE AIFLD

Now, let me get to the actual work of the AIFLD which falls into two categories. One is workers' education. The second is social projects whose objectives is to improve workers' standards of living under the Alliance for Progress.

EDUCATIONAL PHASES OF INSTITUTE

Let me first go into the educational phases of the institute. Small groups of trade unionists from Latin American countries, carefully selected by unions in these countries and covering every country in Latin America except Cuba, Haiti, and Paraguay, are brought to the United States for an 8- to 12-week intensive training course. Our high level course in the United States is designed to train trade union teachers and technicians who can take their skills back to their respective countries to train other trade unionists. As a result, thousands of workers have benefited from this training.

A typical advanced course begins with U.S. university professors teaching modern adult education—the psychology of training adults, how to use visual aids, classroom techniques, and so forth. I would like to say at this point, Mr. Chairman, that quite a number of major universities are represented in our program as instructors in some form or other.

The students then move into specialized subjects such as the history of the labor movement, collective bargaining, labor legislation and social security. Just about every subject of basic interest to a modern, dynamic labor movement is covered. The students also travel around the United States to get a look at our free economy at work, to learn how American workers live, and to understand better how our trade unions operate. The wages and expenses of these students are paid for by the AIFLD here in the United States.

Over 730 young men and women from all these Latin American countries have gone through our Front Royal, Va., institute where our 28th class is now in session. Those instructed through local training courses in over 20 countries and territories are well over 100,000.

As an example of our continually expanding interest in assisting the Latin American labor movement to meet the challenges of today's complex society, 3 years ago we initiated a specialized course in labor economics. Each year, we sponsor two semesters of university level education in labor economics in young Latin American leaders. The program now in session is being conducted at Georgetown University. Following the graduation in October of this year, these young men will return as economic advisers to their own unions.

SOCIAL PROJECTS DEPARTMENT OF AIFLD

The Social Projects Department of AIFLD came into being soon after the Alliance for Progress program was announced by President John F. Kennedy. There was a meeting at the White House and we told the President that we endorsed his concept of emphasizing social development along with the traditional concepts of economic aid. It was evident to us that this could not be done if American aid moneys were channeled solely on a government-to-government basis. We made it clear that we would not participate in a program that would result in the rich getting richer but with no real improvement in the living conditions of the great masses of workers in these countries. We made it clear to President Kennedy that we had a part to play and that some of the Alliance for Progress funds, instead of being spent through business institutions or banks or government, should be channeled through free trade unions for their projects to advance their living standards.

With this in mind, we established the Social Projects Department of AIFLD to give technical assistance to Latin American trade unions for the establishment of credit unions and cooperatives both in the rural and urban areas. Through these activities AIFLD is now the largest U.S. sponsor of workers' low-cost housing in Latin America. We have developed and implemented housing programs in 12 different countries.

Our first big housing project was in Mexico City—the John F. Kennedy housing project which presently houses 20,000 people who formerly lived in the slums of Mexico City.

This project was financed by the International Ladies' Garment Workers, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, all unions affiliated to the AFL-CIO, by a \$10 million, 20-year, 5½-percent loan. This project benefits workers who have never had any decent housing. It is owned by the workers and was sponsored by the Graphic Arts Union of Mexico City. As you may well know, it is not exceptional to find interest rates for home mortgages in Latin America as high as 15 or 20 percent. At the time this loan was made in 1964, we were able to sponsor this program with a 5½-percent return on our investment. I want to emphasize that these moneys were provided by American workers to the Mexican union. This was not U.S. Government funding although we did receive a 100-percent guarantee on the investment from AID.

HOUSING PROJECT IN GEORGETOWN, GUYANA

Some time ago, we broke ground for a housing project in Georgetown in Guyana, where there are to be built 658 low-cost workers' homes costing approximately \$2.2 million, 90 percent of which is being loaned by American unions. The project is sponsored by the Guyana Trade Union Council. Last month we disbursed the first \$2.8 million of a \$6 million loan for low-cost housing to the unions of Venezuela. This loan is being participated in by 15 different AFL-CIO affiliated unions. On all these housing projects the AIFLD provides all necessary technical assistance in planning and implementing the program.

There is a workers' housing bank known as ASINCOOP established with the assistance of AIFLD in Lima, Peru. ASINCOOP is the fastest growing savings and loan association in Lima today with more than 11,000 depositors. Although it is only 5 years old, it has made housing loans of approximately \$5 million. This is something really new in Latin America, workers setting up something similar to our building and loan associations using their own money plus capital loans to lend out at reasonable interest rates for housing.

We have campesino programs going on in many areas of Latin America—educational programs, vocational training, and legal assistance as part of our wide range of programs designed to help the underprivileged rural workers. Some of these programs are carried out in campesino service centers which we have constructed in Colombia and in the northeast of Brazil.

IMPACT PROJECTS PROGRAM

In addition to these activities, the AFL-CIO has established an impact projects program to which it has contributed \$450,000 since November 1964. The purpose of our impact projects program is to assist Latin American trade unions in the development of small projects of socioeconomic nature at the community level. Our effort takes the form of interest-free, soft-currency loans or grants of up to \$5,000. Repayments of loans form part of a revolving fund for additional projects. To date, repayments have amounted to more than \$42,000. This is a real grassroots program involving the self-help features which lead to the genuine participation of people in the solution of their immediate problems. For example, workers and their families are involved in providing water, electricity, and sanitary facilities in remote areas and city slums. Trade unions have joined with their communities in building or refurbishing primary and secondary schools. Cooperatives of all kinds have been formed which meet the pressing needs of less privileged, low-paid and leftout workers. The AFL-CIO Executive Council intends to continue this meaningful worker-to-worker program.

All of this work is being done as part of our effort to help these unions play a more vital and positive role in the economic and social development of their countries. Our basic philosophy shared by our trade union brothers in Latin America is that there will be no real change until the great masses of working people have a greater purchasing power upon which a modern and expanding economy can be built.

SUMMARY

In summary, I would like to remind the members of this committee that our work in Latin America has been based upon the sincere feeling of fraternity and solidarity that exists between the workers of the United States and the workers to the south. We are there by invitation to carry on a program designed to help people develop a fuller and happier life without violating their culture and traditions. Frankly speaking, we vigorously oppose many of the military establishments that are now in power and we are saddened by the awful reality that the gap between the very rich and the very poor continues to grow. However, we think that we have taken the initiative in the area of strengthening free trade unions which will enable the Latin American workers to participate meaningfully in their own development.

I think we are on the right track, and I am proud to be part of this and I resent any inference from any source that the Government assistance given to us in carrying out this vital and important work is a payoff of any kind.

(The documents referred to in the statement follow:)

REPLY TO COMMITTEE PRINT—ANALYSIS AND COMMENT

I. SALIENT FEATURES OF THE LATIN AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT

The journey toward contradiction and distortion is embarked upon from the opening statement. The author generally portrays the Latin American labor movement in the light of Latin American Society—"weak, illiterate, undernourished, ill-housed, discontented, restless, reform-minded." The author disregards the well-known maxim that one cannot generalize about Latin American Society. The well-established labor movement of Argentina and Venezuela, for example, cannot be compared to the labor movement in the Dominican Republic and some Central American countries where the labor unions have only recently been organized. Some of these conditions have been partially alleviated, for example, the plight of the ill-housed, through the many low-cost housing projects which have been constructed with AIFLD assistance and sponsored by the free trade unions of eleven separate countries.

With regard to "political bargaining", the writer states "the adoption of political bargaining as labor's major negotiating system in Latin America is a consequence of the ineffectiveness of other systems . . . collective bargaining with management . . ." Here again, the author demonstrates serious misunderstanding of Latin American labor's historical development, for it is a fact that, until the last decade, collective bargaining was almost unknown in Latin America. It is rather *because* "political bargaining" has proven so ineffective that unions have been rapidly moving toward the concept, and indeed the reality, of modern collective bargaining, as evidenced by the increasing number of labor-management contracts negotiated each year.

"Even Communist-dominated unions, especially those which follow the Moscow line, now generally accept the peaceful road as a viable alternative." In Latin America there are many trade unionists living under this so-called "peaceful road" who would be happy, we are certain, and with some degree of emphasis, to educate the writer to the realities of the alleged peaceful intentions of the Communists. They would be quick to point out the number of Latin American labor leaders who live in constant danger of Communist threat and intimidations, or the number of democratic trade unionists who have been executed or incarcerated in Cuba; or the acts of violence the Communists frequently commit against democratic workers in Uruguay; or the trade unionists in the Dominican Republic who were murdered by Communists; or the candidates for trade union office in Peru who were recently physically beaten, some to incapacitation, by Communists.

The author goes on to say that the Latin American labor movement will be "placated" so long as "political channels remain open and the governments . . . pledge themselves to rapid industrialization." From the viewpoint of any labor

leader, this statement can only be interpreted as one of degradation and insult to the great numbers of Latin American labor leaders who have worked not only for industrialization or the opening of political channels but, more importantly, for the basic *freedom* to bargain collectively and compel reforms.

II. LATIN AMERICAN LABOR POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

The beginning paragraph of this section relates to AFL-CIO Policy. On this subject the report evidences an almost total lack of objectivity and a serious distortion of the facts. Its inclusion is not wholly without value, however, since its misstatement of AFL-CIO policy and historic positions aids greatly in understanding the fundamental bias of the remaining 19 pages of the Committee Print and partially explains the roots of that bias.

To characterize the dominant philosophy of the American labor movement as "business unionism" is a kind of glib oversimplification one hardly expects to find in a publication bearing the imprint of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

The use of a single textbook quote, out of context to buttress this sweeping generalization further suggests that the author's entire treatment of the subject, which the Committee Print ostensibly deals with, was motivated more by a desire to sustain a preconceived viewpoint of the AFL-CIO and its elected leadership than to provide real insight into "Labor Policies and Programs" and the "Alliance for Progress."

A more balanced presentation of the historic philosophical position of the U.S. trade union movement and its concern with political action is expressed by Philip Taft, Professor of Economics at Brown University and one of the most respected students of the U.S. trade union movement:

"The philosophy of American labor is quite simple, but it is not static. A movement that is essentially made up of toilers in the shop and office is not likely to indulge in long-drawn speculations on where it is going. The American labor leader and his followers are not so much concerned about the destiny of the movement as they are with the belief that the next year should be a better year than the present. If one can describe such a simple outlook as a philosophy, one would say that it is hope, supported by bargaining power, that the future will be better than the past. Some might regard such a simple view as superficial and narrow, but, thus far, it has been founded on a correct appraisal of the potentiality of the American economy. There is a tendency for men of imagination and learning to downgrade the aspiration for a better material life for those who work, but is that not the aim of every reform and revolutionary system that has been offered to mankind by the seers and philosophers of the past? Is success a sin? Is not desire to abolish want—to lift the age-long burdens from the back of man—the moral driving force of every movement to regenerate mankind?"

"From the beginning, American organized labor was aware that many problems facing the worker could not be solved at the place of employment. Education, child labor, the conditions of work of women employees, immigration, and a variety of questions ranging from the sanitary standards at the work place to the voting rights of citizens can only be answered by the government.

"Union leaders of the past and present have understood that the government can influence, if not determine, the well-being of the working population. The differences that have arisen over political action, if one excludes a small number of anarchists and syndicalists, have been over the type of politics that the labor movement was to promote, and the extent and kind of program that the labor movement would endorse. In fact, one of the reasons that the AFL was launched in the middle 1880's was to help establish the state federation of labor as the political arm of the labor movement."

As the above statement suggests, although the trade union movement in the United States has not been doctrinaire but rather pragmatic in its approach, it has recognized from its earliest beginnings that all problems affecting the workers cannot be solved at the collective bargaining table. American labor has not followed the view—expressed in the Committee Print—that "the role of government vis-a-vis trade unionism is to insure labor's rights with respect to collective bargaining."

The author's conclusion that: "Indeed, free enterprise and free trade unionism are inseparable, one cannot survive without the other" comes as no surprise since it is only one of many opinions, based on a superficial analysis, expressed

as a fact. This statement of opinion would not merit comment except that it constitutes the basis for the author's subsequent comments regarding the AFL-CIO's relations with trade unions abroad, namely that:

(1) "... it is this philosophy which the U.S. labor leadership has attempted to implant abroad", and

(2) "This has often made accommodations with other national labor movements difficult. Frequently, whatever accommodation has been reached in the international sphere has been based primarily on the financial and political strength of the AFL-CIO."

These two statements in the Committee Print conveniently ignore the following facts:

(1) The AFL-CIO and its member unions historically have maintained warm and fraternal relations with trade union movements, such as the TUC in the United Kingdom, which are tied to political parties which are committed, not to a "free enterprise" system such as exists in the United States, but to a socialist system. This relationship has expressed itself in mutual exchanges of financial and moral support where member unions here or abroad were engaged in prolonged strikes, organizing drives, or were undergoing political attacks of one kind or another.

(2) Historically, the AFL-CIO and its member unions have consistently given broad support to national and international labor organizations which represent workers in industries which are government-owned in many countries, but which are privately-owned under our system. At no time has AFL-CIO or its member unions done or said anything in giving its support, financial and otherwise, to such groups which could possibly be construed as indicative of any interest or desire to influence a shift from government to private ownership of these industries. Nor has such support ever been influenced by the fact that those industries were government, rather than privately, owned. Indeed, not even its most hostile critics have ever suggested such an interest or desire.

This longstanding warm fraternal relationship between the AFL-CIO and socialist-oriented unions abroad (both in developed and developing countries) and the active support and cooperation the AFL-CIO and its member unions have extended to unions representing workers in government-owned industries abroad—which under our system are accepted as properly in the private sector—hardly support the view which, by innuendo, the author ascribes to the AFL-CIO; to wit: "Indeed, free enterprise and free trade unionism are inseparable; one cannot survive without the other" and which, the author then proceeds to state, the AFL-CIO has attempted to "implant abroad" which has in turn "often made accommodation with other national labor movements difficult."

Another contradiction in the author's tortured logic should not go unnoticed. After emphasizing what the author construes to be an almost apolitical stance by the trade union movement in the United States on page 6 of the Print, he stated on page 7 that: "Frequently, whatever accommodation has been reached in the international sphere has been based primarily on the financial and political strength of the AFL-CIO."

With regard to the "Current Rift over AFL-CIO Policy", the author here gives further evidence—to what becomes increasingly apparent with every page of the Committee Print—that his primary objective is to present a particular view of AFL-CIO international policy rather than to assess the effectiveness of "Labor Policies and Programs" in Latin America as a part of the Committee's "Survey of the Alliance for Progress". The author, having grossly misstated the policy of the AFL-CIO in Section II (B), proceeds in Section II (C), using a much-favored technique of the professional propagandist, to hang the "alleged" policy around the necks of his prime target in the document, the elected leadership of the AFL-CIO. He states: "The policy described above has won the adherence of most, but not all, of the leadership of U.S. Labor." Then comes the big surprise. The author reveals: "The most articulate dissent has come from Walter Reuther . . ." The natural question is: dissent from what? Unfortunately, the Committee Print leaves this question unanswered since there is no specific statement of dissent by Mr. Reuther included in the document to which meaningful response can be made.

It is in this section that the author's bias comes to full flower. Stating that: "It is beyond the scope of this paper to explore the causes of the break between the AFL-CIO and the UAW or to attempt to assess the merits of the dispute", the author then proceeds, without even bothering to quote the two individuals he

names, to ascribe viewpoints to Mr. Meany and Mr. Reuther using loaded terms which have no place in an official publication of an important Senate Committee. For instance, Mr. Reuther and UAW "tend", in the author's words, to be "less doctrinaire and more accommodating to the various brands of trade unionism which exist in the international labor movement" whereas he has Mr. Meany "rigidly" rejecting "any" relations with Communist unions.

This, of course, leaves much unsaid. As previously noted, the AFL-CIO has throughout its history worked with unions of many political hues and orientations. Specifically, in Latin America, the area the Print allegedly is concerned with, Mr. Meany, acting on behalf of the AFL-CIO, has consistently supported with word and deed organizations having many diverse viewpoints. For example:

(a) The CTM in Mexico, a nationalist movement which is part of the dominant political grouping in Mexico;

(b) Both the NWU and the BITU, national unions in Jamaica, which are in turn allied to each of the two major political parties; and

(c) In Peru, Venezuela, Chile and other countries in Central and South America, the AFL-CIO enjoys harmonious relationships of longstanding with many unions whose "modus vivendi" is entirely different from their North American counterpart. The common denominator of these relationships has been a belief in bettering the lives of workers through democratic trade unionism and not through the impositions of the U.S. system on these labor movements.

This policy certainly demonstrates a willingness to "accept foreign unions on their own terms", an inclination which the author would have us believe does not characterize AFL-CIO policy and programs.

In his addresses to graduating classes of the AIFLD educational courses, President Meany has consistently said: "We have no desire to impose on the workers of these countries the American system of trade unionism. We realize that our system is built around our culture, economy and general way of life and we realize that our system might not fit the system of some other country. Our method of trade unionism might not be the method in another country; but we are convinced of one thing, that no matter what the type of movement, it must be based upon the freedom of the worker to choose for himself the representative who will speak to his employer in his behalf. That is why we emphasize the word 'freedom' in everything we do. If he is to share in the fruits of his society, he must be free. Our enemies have known this for a long time."

It is true that the AFL-CIO has not collaborated with the so-called unions in the USSR. Unfortunately, the author neglected to point out that the AFL-CIO has consistently refused to collaborate with *any* "labor movement" under the heel of totalitarian control when workers were not free to chart their own destiny.

This refusal to collaborate with state-controlled unions has applied not *only* to those in the Communist bloc, as the author by devious omission suggests, but to puppet unions of the Dominican Republic under Trujillo, of Peru under Odria, Venezuela under Perez Jimenez, Spain under Franco, as well as many other past and contemporary right-wing regimes. At no point did the democratic and oppressed trade unionists of those nations feel that they did not have a friend in the AFL-CIO. Many of these democratic trade unionists, once the yoke of an oppressive dictatorship was cast off, were elected to positions of national leadership. Perhaps the author might have investigated a few such cases prior to writing about "accommodating to the various brands of trade unionism". Such investigation would have precluded the use of such an obviously distorted and loaded statement that President Meany "has tended to equate 'democratic' with 'anti-communist'" since all of the aforementioned right-wing dictatorships were avowedly "anti-communist". A cursory review by the author of AFL-CIO resolutions would have established the consistency of the AFL-CIO's opposition to all forms of totalitarianism.

In a final burst of distortion and misstatement the author concludes: "One of the things that led to Reuther's resignation from the board of trustees of the AIFLD was the latter's tendency to adopt a 'good guys versus bad guys' approach to international labor relations."

Mr. Reuther's resignation from AIFLD's Board of Trustees occurred simultaneously with his resignations from all his AFL-CIO posts, except the Industrial Union Department. It was not, as the author's choice of words suggests, an isolated resignation stemming from expressed philosophical disagreements with AIFLD's "approach".

III. UNITED STATES-LATIN AMERICAN LABOR RELATIONS: 1945-1960

Again in this section, the use of innuendo, loaded words, questionable sources and the omission of certain salient facts combine to sustain the author's attack on the AFL-CIO and its leadership.

With regard to the establishment of the ICFTU and ORIT, the history here is generally accurate as far as it goes. Two points are worth noting:

1) The use of certain words with source documentation to give an innocent incident a sinister implication is beautifully illustrated in the author's statement: "The State Department reportedly took a direct interest in planning Romualdi's itinerary." The use of the term "reportedly" stems, not from any statement of the late Serafino Romualdi or anyone in a position to speak knowledgeably of these events in the State Department in 1946, but rather from a 1967 article in "The Nation", a journal of opinion with a single, generally acknowledged, viewpoint to purvey. The real trick in a statement of this kind, however, is not the failure to establish its authenticity through the use of questionable sources but rather the wording of the statement itself. For anyone planning extensive travel of this nature in Latin America just after World War II, given the Nazi intrigues in Latin America during the war, the nature of U.S.-Soviet relations, the ascendancy of right-wing dictatorships in Latin America and the status of the labor movement in Latin America in 1946, it would not have been viewed as unusual or sinister for the "State Department" to take "a direct interest in planning Romualdi's itinerary".

2) Continuing to see the entire labor movement of the Western Hemisphere as one gigantic anti-communist plot, the author states that ORIT's founding was "for the specific purpose of combatting Communist infiltration of the Latin American Labor Movement." This, of course, is the kind of "black and white" approach which denotes a conspiratorial mentality. ORIT came into being to promote and strengthen democratic trade unions. Because Communist-dominated unions are autocratic, ORIT is anti-Communist; however, for the same reason, it is anti-military dictatorship and anti-company union.

Once again, having created a fallacious premise, the author leaps to a false conclusion when he says: "This is one reason for what seems to be a decline in ORIT prestige in Latin America". The author cites no evidence to support this rather vague, general statement. In terms of the usual measures of success for such an organization—membership, financial resources, etc.—any objective review of ORIT's position today could hardly result in the statement quoted above. Citing three ORIT positions, which happen to coincide with official U.S. positions, as a basis for alleging that "To many Latin Americans, this looks like ORIT is an instrument of the U.S. State Department", the author, without any attempt to assess the merits of the three examples, uses the old "guilt by association" technique.

IV. THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR FREE LABOR DEVELOPMENT

The author's obsessive "anti-communist plot" approach in analyzing AFL-CIO policy really obscures the facts in discussing AIFLD's creation. He opens this section with the flat-footed statement that:

"The American Institute For Free Labor Development was founded in 1961 primarily in response to the threat of Castroite infiltration and eventual control of major labor movements within Latin America."

The author then supports this contention with a careful weaving of words such as: "Shortly after the Bay of Pigs episode in April 1961, President Kennedy endorsed the idea of a Latin American labor program. . . ." (Emphasis supplied).

President Kennedy had been in office only three months in April 1961. To suggest that the creation of the Alliance for Progress stemmed in part from Castro's actions is not without some validity. However, to attempt to depict the creation of AIFLD as nothing more than a reaction to the Cuban situation ignores a long history of involvement in Latin America by the AFL-CIO and member unions and conveniently overlooks some relevant facts as to AIFLD's beginning, facts which were supplied to the author some months ago and which he obviously chose to ignore.

Since the text of the section relating to AIFLD's structure and programs relied chiefly on information supplied to the author by AIFLD, there are only one or two minor observations which require clarification.

Regarding the Institute at Front Royal, the statement is made that "particular emphasis" is given "the theme of democracy versus totalitarianism". Unless the author defines approximately three days out of 10 to 12 weeks of training as constituting "particular emphasis", it is hard to determine on what basis this judgment was made.

The author's statement that the Labor Economist program is "generally considered to be AIFLD's best educational project" doesn't, unfortunately, provide any clue as to the basis for this assessment. Nevertheless, in a document characterized by an almost totally unrelenting negative statement of AFL-CIO policy and AIFLD's program, any positive comment, however ambiguous, affords a brief, welcome respite.

V. THE AIFLD AND THE LATIN AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT

The author seems to have a facility for incorporating baseless assertion and misstatement in the opening passages of each section of his "Study". Here again, in Section V (A), he makes an apparent unequivocal statement (actually a redundant general misstatement carried over from Section III (B)) as to the condition of ORIT; namely, that it is declining. More exhaustive research could have shown that, as a matter of fact and not conjecture, the ORIT has grown much stronger since the AIFLD's inception, the reason being that ORIT has been able to divert most of its funds to the organizing efforts and servicing of their affiliates, while AIFLD has focused on the educational/social programs peculiar to its function. Consequently, the efforts of the AIFLD have served to implement and strengthen the activity of ORIT.

Within this series of irresponsible misstatements, the writer authoritatively claims that "The AFL-CIO's energies and resources have consequently been concentrated upon the AIFLD to the detriment of the ORIT budget." More definite and objective analysis of budget distributions (which information was readily and voluntarily made available by the AFL-CIO to the writer) would have clearly shown that the ORIT budget has not been adversely affected. Even the most perfunctory examination would have disclosed the exact amount which the AFL-CIO contributes to each organization.

The author then states that "The rise of the AIFLD and the decline of ORIT are used by the Communists and the CLASC militants to 'prove' their traditional claim that the Latin American labor movement is simply another area in which the Yankees 'call the tune'". It is difficult to determine how the author rationalizes his logic and line of reasoning through the use of statements such as this, since the Communists and CLASC have consistently followed the same path, that of being critical of everything which has even the slightest semblance of freedom and democracy. They have been critical of AFL-CIO activities even here in the United States; they have consistently and persistently attacked and harassed the AIFLD in every country where the Communists and CLASC have a following. Similarly, they have been vociferous in their attacks upon ORIT, continually alleging its decline. It would appear then that, instead of being "proof" of the inadequacies of AIFLD and ORIT such statements, allowing for their origins, would support a case for the validity and strength of both organizations.

The writer goes on to allege that "The problem of Communist subversion of the Latin American labor movement has been central to the AFL-CIO/AIFLD operations in the region". We concede that this is one of the paramount issues confronting several countries of Latin America. It is an historical certainty that a Communist-dominated labor movement in any country is a definite and obvious threat to economic and political freedom.

Anyone interested in elevating and improving the living standard of human beings must recognize the inherent danger of Communist subversion whether it be in the labor movement or any other sphere of social-political-economic activity. History has chronicled that those who have chosen to hide their heads in the sand have either died or have lived to regret their complacency.

VI. THE LATIN AMERICAN CONFEDERATION OF CHRISTIAN TRADE UNIONS (CLASC)

The author describes the Latin American Confederation of Christian Trade Unions (CLASC) and gives a brief history of its development in the Western Hemisphere. He states that, "The origins of this movement are grounded in Catholic doctrine, especially as set forth in the social encyclicals *Rerum Novarum*

(1891), *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931), and more recently *Mater et Magistra* (1961) and *Pacem in Terris* (1963)." He then goes on to explain that the CLASC is a "third force", nationalistic, Latin American movement and quotes Chilean President Eduardo Frei Montalva as describing Christian Democracy (*sic* CLASC) as a "... middle way between capitalism and communism".

This is a superficial and naive description of the CLASC. There is serious question as to whether CLASC truly represents the spirit of the above-mentioned encyclicals. At least two significant Latin labor movements, the Union of Colombian Workers (UTC) and the Costa Rican General Confederation of Workers (Rerum Novarum), which pre-date the CLASC and were founded as Catholic movements, encountered great philosophical accommodation with the ORIT and considerable antagonism towards the CLASC.

CLASC maintains that the fundamental economic structure of Latin American society is all wrong and that there must be a social and economic upheaval in order to effect change. They do not necessarily oppose violence to achieve this change, although they have never offered specific proposals on the precise nature of the new society they hope to create. They regard the ORIT, and other socio-economic organizations which work within the prevailing system in order to achieve reforms, as palliative and ineffective. This philosophy of CLASC has frequently made their policies all but indistinguishable from extremist revolutionary elements including the communists. This was so during the ill-fated general strike called by the communists of Peru in 1964; similarly, they fiercely oppose, along with the communists, many elements of the Latin American democratic left that are not aligned with Christian Democratic parties.

CLASC has been particularly hostile to all things North American, and their propaganda has been especially vituperative against the AFL-CIO and the AIFLD. Even a casual study of their publications makes evident that far more space is devoted to attacking the United States and "Imperialism" than to criticizing totalitarianism and communism.

The CLASC advocates Latin Americanism as opposed to Inter-Americanism. This means that they oppose the inclusion of the United States on Inter-American social and economic and political bodies, such as the OAS.

All of the above gives clear indication to experienced labor hands in Latin America that CLASC's policy and philosophy run contrary to the Inter-American constructive spirit of the Alliance for Progress. Yet, the author of the Committee Print suggests that the United States Government might do well to extend to CLASC the benefits of its programs. When CLASC actively appeared in the Hemisphere with the assistance of money provided from Germany, the AFL-CIO exercised great patience with the new group in the hope that their extremist viewpoint would turn out to be more the result of youthful zeal and inexperience rather than meaningful hostility. For a long time the AIFLD held its doors open to the CLASC and even, in one or two instances, courted their collaboration. AFL-CIO President George Meany once invited CLASC General Secretary Emilio Maspero to the AFL-CIO headquarters in Washington in order to explore possible areas of agreement. These friendly overtures were rebuffed with insult and invective. Consequently, CLASC was no longer invited to participate in AIFLD programs, although individual members of CLASC-affiliated unions are even today welcome to participate if they so desire.

The author would have us believe that the CLASC is an authentic force in Latin America, although it has a dues paying membership that "probably does not exceed 300,000". This is sheer naivete. CLASC's funds are supplied from European sources, not dues; and, although the funds that are at its disposal far exceed the annual budget of the ORIT, estimates of CLASC's true membership are only a tiny fraction of the ORIT total, even excluding ORIT's North American membership. By CLASC's own admission, it prefers to work with the intellectual elite rather than develop a movement which is legitimately trade union in concept. We view this philosophy as dangerous to democratic trade union development.

The author of the Committee Print states that CLASC is the labor arm of the Christian Democratic Party. It is important to note in any discussion of bona fide workers' movements of Latin America that almost all of the labor movements that comprise ORIT were already long-established national movements at the time ORIT was founded. With the exception of Ecuador, every CLASC affiliate was organized after 1954 by the CLASC itself. It stretches the imagination too far when the author suggests that CLASC is a grass roots Latin American workers' movement.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS
OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1968.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, U.S. Senate, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just completed a review of the Committee Print of the Senate Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, entitled "Survey of the Alliance for Progress Labor Policies and Programs", together with a Report of the General Accounting Office.

We note that Mr. Elmer Staats, the Comptroller General of the United States, in his May 20, 1968 letter of transmittal to Senator Fulbright concerning the GAO review of the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), clearly stated that:

"We were not able during our review to reach any specific conclusion on the relative success of the Institute as an instrument for achieving U.S. foreign policy objectives in the labor sector. We agree that the Institute represents a realistic and imaginative approach to some of the major problems of the Western Hemisphere. For example, it provides a means whereby the workers of Latin America can participate in the Alliance for Progress and become more active in the economic and social progress of their countries."

The AIFLD has submitted a memorandum concerning the GAO report which you will find on page 80 of the Committee Print. From this memorandum it is clear that the AIFLD is fully aware of its public accountability for the funds which have been provided to it from the Agency for International Development. We will continue to exercise the utmost scrutiny demanded by the GAO.

We have taken due note that in the Foreword signed by you, you state that "The points of view expressed do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Subcommittee or any member thereof." Please find enclosed detailed analysis of the Committee Print.

We must, however, point out that, unfortunately, the survey of the Senate Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs contains quite a number of inaccuracies. The author made little attempt to make a balanced assessment of labor policies and programs in relation to the Committee's overall survey of the Alliance for Progress. The document reflects preconceived and biased viewpoints without any foundation in fact. Among other things it charges that:

1. The trade union movement of the U.S. is trying to force its philosophy and its methods on the Latin American Labor movements.
2. The U.S. labor movement is only a "bread-and-butter" movement and business-oriented and, therefore, is not equipped to work with Latin American labor movements which the document asserts are more ideologically and politically oriented.

3. That the AFL-CIO and the AIFLD are blindly and negatively anti-Communist and equate anti-Communism as such with democratic principles.

Though the Foreword of the document states that the Dockery Study is published for the Subcommittee at this time solely as a basis for discussion and further inquiry by the Subcommittee, its contents have already been given wide circulation in the United States and throughout Latin America. It is particularly unfair to circulate such misrepresentation as if it were already an official Senate document.

As a sample of how this document is being used, let me quote from the English language Moscow radio broadcast to Central America "Peace and Progress":

"... In Washington the Senate Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs has published a report on the activities of the so-called American Institute for the Development of Free Trade Unions. The authors of this report point out that this institute has become the main instrument of the U.S. Government for the practical execution of its policy toward the Latin American trade unions. The report comes to the unequivocal conclusion that the State Department, the leadership of the AFL-CIO, and the American monopolies are jointly carrying out a common policy of subordinating the activities of the Latin American trade unions to the interests of U.S. monopoly capital"

"... The American Institute for the Development of Free Trade Unions is in fact a special school of the CIA which prepares agents for undermining the Latin-American trade unions from inside. During the last 5 years it trained 60,000 persons who have been given the task of taking the leadership of the Latin American trade unions into their own hands. The scale of this subversive operation of

the Americans can be compared only with Hitler's notorious fifth column"

The AIFLD, under my instructions, cooperated with the Committee in answering a detailed questionnaire presented to it by Mr. Dockery, the Committee's representative. We cannot understand why this study chose not to make use of the replies prepared by AIFLD.

Let us cite some of the misrepresentations contained in the Committee Print.

1. The Dockery concept of U.S. and Latin American Labor and their respective roles in the political life of their nations as mentioned on pages 2 and 3 of the report leads to grave misjudgments of the role played by labor in societies with different social systems. The statement "even communist dominated unions, especially those which follow the Moscow line, now generally accept the peaceful role as a viable alternative", (see page 3), is as dangerous as it is untrue. This type of wishful thinking can lead to the same false conclusion which considered Castro as a social reformer bent upon the democratization of Cuba.

2. On page 6, the report states on the one hand that "in these circumstances many Latins question the role of the AIFLD as an independent voice of U.S. labor and view it instead as a chosen instrument of the U.S. Government". On the other hand, the report recommends that the U.S. government should exercise more control and supervision over AIFLD. This is an obvious contradiction.

3. The report categorically declares: "Decisions relating to official United States-Latin American labor policy and programs should be under the firm control of the Department of State and should not be delegated to a private institution or contracted out." If this statement refers to official U.S. Government policy, then it is impermissible as a recommendation applicable to the AIFLD because the latter is a voluntary organization, an auxiliary of the AFL-CIO, with management representation in its policy board. If this statement is directed at the AIFLD, it is tantamount to a call for its disavowal by the U.S. Government. This attitude towards the relations between the U.S. Government and voluntary organizations has no place in our democratic society.

4. On page 7, the report deals with the "current rift" in the AFL-CIO. This item does not belong in the Report and has nothing to do with the subject matter which is supposed to be a survey on the Alliance for Progress. Dragging this subject into the survey only demonstrates further the author's prejudice against those who are unwilling to accept the Labor Front of the USSR as bona fide free trade unions.

5. The treatment of the history and background of American labor's activities in Latin America has many factual errors (pages 7 and 8). See attached analysis.

6. The whole attempt on pages 12 and 13 to set up the AIFLD as a competitor of the ORIT fails to point out that the ORIT General Secretary and four of the most important Latin American labor leaders are on the AIFLD Board of Trustees helping to formulate its policy. As a matter of fact, the AIFLD is supported by and in turn lends its complete support to the ORIT and its affiliated organizations.

7. On page 13 it is stated that the AIFLD "has involved the AFL-CIO in some awkward contradictions of its principles that the trade unions should not be tied to political parties". The fact of the matter is that the AFL-CIO has been working for more than 20 years with organizations like the CTM of Mexico, the CTP of Peru, and the CTV of Venezuela, and many other major trade union confederations that have direct ties to political parties. Moreover, it is noteworthy that the American Federation of Labor and thereafter the AFL-CIO has maintained warm, close, and fraternal relations with the Trade Union Congress of Great Britain since 1894 despite the fact that the British TUC is more closely tied with a political party than any free labor national center in Latin America. Our only insistence is that the unions with which we cooperate reject all association with or control by totalitarian political parties.

8. The report is consistently biased in favor of CLASC (pages 15 through 18) and generally against AIFLD's cooperation with the U.S. business sector in the promotion of economic growth, social justice and democracy in Latin America.

The report, if not repudiated, would be a great disservice to the American people, and the U.S. Senate as well as to the democratic inter-American labor movement which has been working hard to overcome misery and poverty in our hemisphere. Therefore, to help counteract the damage resulting from the circulation of the Dockery Study on both sides of the Iron Curtain, we respectfully request that the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs issue as a Committee print the AIFLD response to the Committee's questionnaire, this letter and the AFL-CIO evaluation of the Dockery Study.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MEANY, *President.*

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1968.

Mr. GEORGE MEANY,
President, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: I have just returned from Oregon, where I have been devoting all my time to my campaign for reelection. Your letter of August 5 was awaiting me upon my return, and on top of it was a copy of Pat Holt's August 14 letter to you.

Your letter concerns me very much, because I think you know that the last thing I would want to do would be to be a party to doing an injustice either directly or indirectly to any American labor program.

The Committee Print of the Senate Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, entitled, "Survey of the Alliance for Progress Labor Policies and Programs," together with a Report of the General Accounting Office, is, as you know, a staff report and not a Committee report. It was prepared by Robert Dockery. However, that does not excuse the Subcommittee from any harm resulting from the staff Committee report, if its contents are in error.

The preparation of staff Committee reports is a long-standing practice on the part of Committees, generally, in the Senate, but as far as I am concerned, I want to make clear that I shall give the critics of this report a full and complete opportunity to make their record against this report. Then, I shall insist that the Subcommittee, itself, submit a report setting forth its official position.

To that end, if it meets with your approval, I would like to suggest that you authorize me to insert in the Congressional Record on an early date after we reconvene in September, with appropriate explanatory remarks, your letter of August 5 and the memorandum entitled, "Reply to Committee Print—Analysis and Comment." I also would like to insert the correspondence that I have received from other labor leaders, such as Joe Beirne, who wrote to me under date of August 13.

Following that, I would like to schedule a public hearing to be held by the Subcommittee, at which you and such other spokesmen as you would recommend the Subcommittee invite would present their views on the staff Committee report. In making such a record, I shall ask the Subcommittee, itself, to submit to the full Foreign Relations Committee and to the Senate an official report, including the making available of reprints of the Committee hearings.

In retrospect, I wish we had had these hearings before the staff committee report was printed and issued. However, that is not the practice that is followed by Senate Committees, but I have come to the conclusion that it should be. I wish to make very clear that Pat Holt, Counsel of our Subcommittee, is not deserving of any criticism in respect to this matter, because he followed the procedure that is generally followed by staff directors in respect to staff Committee reports.

Please advise me if the procedure I have outlined in this letter meets with your approval.

With best wishes,
Cordially,

WAYNE MORSE.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS
OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., August 27, 1968.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for your reply to my correspondence concerning the Committee Print of the Senate Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, entitled, "Survey of the Alliance for Progress Labor Policies and Programs." I quite agree with your comments and I am pleased to know that you would like to schedule a public hearing to be held by the Subcommittee at which our views on the staff Committee report can be made known.

I have asked Mr. Ernest S. Lee to contact Mr. Holt, Acting Chief of Staff of the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, so that a convenient date can be established.

With every good wish,
Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MEANY,
President.

STATEMENT BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 19, 1954

Because some democratic powers have failed to recognize the real nature of the Chinese Communist dictatorship and its pivotal role in Moscow's drive for world domination, the International situation has deteriorated seriously in recent months. Furthermore, by discontinuing its immediate post-war policy of granting national independence and equal treatment to colonial peoples, the prestige and position of western democracy have been gravely weakened especially in Asia and Africa. Thus have the Communists been enabled to save their puppet regime in North Korea and to pervert the yearning of the people of Indo-China for national independence into a decisive phase of the Soviet campaign to conquer Southeast Asia and dominate the world.

Against this background of events, must we now view the indecision in Western diplomacy and Molotov's machinations and maneuvers at the Geneva Conference. Under these circumstances, the Executive Council of the AFL declares that the fate and freedom of Indo-China are now the concern and responsibility not only of the Vietnamese, not only of France or the United States, but of the entire free world, of liberty-loving people everywhere. Realizing the urgency of American initiative at this critical hour, we call upon our government to be unsparing in its efforts to rally the greatest support of the Vietnamese people and secure the broadest collective international action for assuring the full national independence of Indo-China and halting the tide of Communist conquest. Towards thus furthering the cause of world peace and freedom, we suggest action by our government along the following lines:

(1) In view of the fact that, after the UN repelled Communist aggression in Korea, massive military support was rushed by the Moscow-Peiping Axis from the Korean front to their Vietminh puppets, there should immediately be convoked a Special Session of the UN General Assembly to mobilize maximum world support for ending the war in Indo-China, safeguarding its national independence and territorial integrity and helping its reconstruction.

(2) At this Special Session of the UN General Assembly, the US representatives should insist on full application of the principle of free elections in Indo-China—just as firmly as our government has insisted on its genuine application in relation to Korea and Germany.

(3) Within the provisions of the UN Charter for regional defense organizations, our government should seek to build a Pacific Alliance for Peace and Freedom which would include all freedom-loving peoples willing to join it.

(4) America should likewise encourage and assist the free nations of Asia not yet ready to join the aforementioned alliance to develop their own effective resistance to Communist subversion of their democratic institutions and to organize united action to prevent Moscow-Peiping aggression against their national independence and territorial integrity.

(5) Towards implementing the complete national sovereignty of the Vietnamese and towards proving that democracy and not Communism can help them meet their needs, the US and its democratic allies should give a practical demonstration of their sincere interest in the economic as well as political advancement of the people by transferring the foreign investment in Indo-China (about \$300,000,000) to the Vietnamese people as aid to the reconstruction of their war-ravaged land. Until such time as a democratically-elected national government has been established, this transferred interest should be held in trust and administered by an International Commission representing Pakistan, Thailand, Burma, India, and the Philippines for the purpose of improving the working and living conditions of the people of Indo-China.

(6) Congress should grant President Eisenhower standby authority to take all measures he may require for helping to train a Vietnam National Army and build a Pacific Alliance for Peace and Freedom strong enough to hasten the end of the war in Indo-China, assure its national independence, and protect the free nations of Asia against further imperialist aggression and expansion by the Moscow-Peiping Axis. In this connection we emphasize that a strong united front of the democracies—demonstrated in immediate positive steps for collective action—would serve to improve the prospects of making the Soviet bloc less intransigent and thereby increase the likelihood of reasonable armistice terms. The policy of postponing until after the Geneva conclave, steps for attaining such collective action by the democracies only serves to encourage Soviet aggression and utterly unacceptable armistice terms in Indo-China. The great task of the peace-

ful and freedom-loving nations is, therefore, to mobilize military strength and insure the strongest resistance during the Geneva negotiations and not afterward when a reasonable negotiated settlement would no longer be possible because of allied weakness and disunity. We must not lose sight of the fact that, given the present disarray in the democratic camp, the Communists are taking while the conferees are talking history provides an overwhelming proof that in dealing with totalitarian aggression—whether it be Nazi or Communist—democratic weakness and wavering breed war while democratic strength and united action blocks war. Fear of displacing the Communist warlords during the Geneva Conference can lead only to disastrous appeasement, that is, to aggravating still more gravely the danger of a world conflagration.

(7) Finally, we appeal to our government to impress strongly upon France and Britain the urgency of learning from the costly experience in Indo-China. Let our allies act now to break with their colonialist policies and practices—especially in Egypt, Morocco, and Tunisia—before the Communist agents of Soviet imperialism come into these crucial areas in full force to distort and destroy the national and democratic aspirations of these peoples. Once these peoples have gained their full national independence, equality and democracy, they will have something really worthwhile to fight for and become our loyal allies in preventing another world war, preserving peace, and promoting freedom and social and economic progress.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR FREE LABOR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATE, FOUNDATION, AND
INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS 1962-68

W. R. Grace & Company	Brazilian Light & Power
Rockefeller Brothers Fund	First National Bank of Boston
International Telephone and Telegraph	United Fruit Company
Pan American World Airways	Anglo-Lautaro Nitrate Corporation
The United Corporation	IBM World Trade Corporation
David Rockefeller	International Basic Economy Corporation
Kennecott Copper Corporation	Sinclair Oil
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	Max Ascoli Fund Inc.
Koppers Company	International Mining Corporation
Gillette	Carrier Corporation
Shell Petroleum	Coca-Cola Export Corporation
Crown Zellerbach	Container Corporation of America
The Anaconda Company	Stauffer Chemical Company
ACFE (Venezuela)	American-Standard
King Ranch	International Packers
Sterling Drug, Inc.	Olin
General Foods Corporation	Standard Oil of California
Loeb Rhoades & Company	Warner-Lambert
National Biscuit Company	Corning Glass
Owens-Illinois Glass	Eli Lilly & Company
Union Carbide Corporation	J. Henry Schroeder Banking Corporation
Ebasco Industries	United Shoe Machinery
Reader's Digest	Celanese Corporation
Monsanto	Bacardi Corporation
Southern Peru Copper Corporation	Schering Foundation
Merck	Bankers Trust Company
Pfizer International	Bristol Myers
Otis Elevator Company	Chase Manhattan Bank
Industrias Kaiser Argentina	Kimberly-Clark
American Cyanamid	Upjohn Company
First National City Bank	Insurance Company of North America
International Paper Company	3M Company
Mobil Oil Company	American International Oil Company
Standard Fruit Company	Combustion Engineering
American Telephone & Telegraph	Sheraton Corporation of America
Corn Products	Chemetron Corporation
Council for Latin America	Motion Picture Association of America
Johnson & Johnson	Deltec
St. Regis Paper Company	
American Can Company	

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Meany.

REGIONAL LABOR INSTITUTES OPERATED BY AFL-CIO

For the record, I think inasmuch as a number of the members may not have reviewed the situation, I want to make a short description of these activities. The AFL-CIO operates three regional labor institutes, American Institute for Free Labor Development, the AIFLD, which was referred to in Mr. Meany's statement; the African American Labor Center, referred to as AALC; and the Asian American Free Labor Institute, the AAFLI.

The AIFLD, serving Latin America, is the oldest of the institutes, having been founded in 1961. The other two date from 1965 and 1968, respectively. All three receive more than 90 percent of their financial support from the AID agency.

Total foreign aid obligations through fiscal year 1969 for these institutes amounts to \$33 million approximately, with the AIFLD having received the lion's share of about \$28 million.

For fiscal year 1970 the AID reports that the AIFLD will receive \$5.8 million, the AALC \$1.5 million, and the AAFLI \$800,000, totaling \$8.1 million. These figures are fairly firm as of now, and with the possibility that they may be increased as much as \$2 million.

More than 70 percent of the total AID funds for labor programs are channeled through these AFL-CIO operations.

The institutes spend these funds on labor training programs, as has been described, and on various other activities, and Mr. George Meany is the president of each of these institutes. All three AFL-CIO institutes operate under technical assistance contracts with AID.

SUBCONTRACTORS

Beginning in June 1968 AID officials gave approval to the AFL-CIO's request that the institutes be permitted to subcontract with individual AFL-CIO affiliated unions. Although AID provides the funds for these subcontracts the subcontractual arrangements stipulated; and I quote, "It is understood that the institute"—AIFLD in this case—"stands in the place of AID in relation to the subcontractors, Communications Workers of America." The subcontractors perform a variety of tasks including union organizing, worker education, and basic research.

AID to date has provided about \$1.5 million for these subcontracts. The amount of funds to be provided for fiscal year 1970 has not been decided but will probably be in the neighborhood of \$2 million.

There are many reports to the effect that these union subcontractors formerly received funding through CIA-supported foundations. The two subcontractors most frequently mentioned in this regard are the International Federation of Petroleum & Chemical Workers and the Retail Clerks International Association.

LABOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

The Labor Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance is an ex-officio private sector group chaired by Mr. George Meany. It was es-

established in late 1961 as a result of some informal talks between the late President Kennedy, Mr. Arthur Goldberg, then Secretary of Labor, and Mr. George Meany. According to the Department of State and I quote, "The function of this committee is to meet regularly with officials of AID, the Department of State and the Department of Labor for the express purpose of interchanging ideas of method, manner, and scope of international labor programs. . . ."

The minutes of the committee's meetings make it clear that discussion is not limited to international labor affairs. Foreign policy issues in general, of course, are also reviewed. Although the minutes do not carry a security classification, the AID requests that they not be made public as a whole.

IS INVESTMENT OF FUNDS JUSTIFIED?

The question, of course, at issue here is, whether or not the investment of this size of these funds is justified, and whether it is in the public interest to continue this kind of program, and this was the question which was raised in the former hearing with the Secretary of State.

The former report, which Mr. Meany referred to in his own statement, prepared by the staff of the subcommittee on Latin America is, of course, available and Mr. Meany takes exception to it, and also available is the full report of the GAO.

ALLEGED AFFILIATION WITH THE CIA

Mr. Meany, in one of the matters which came to my attention earlier this year, there was a two-part series appearing in the St. Louis Post Dispatch on April 13 and 14 of this year written by, I believe, the head of their Washington Bureau and certainly one of the most talented and experienced reporters in the business, Mr. Richard Dudman. From these two articles some of this material has been taken, and I quote:

"The Agency for International Development has picked up the tab for some of the 'CIA orphans,' the overseas programs that used to be financed secretly by the Central Intelligence Agency.

"The new conduits, taking the place of the mysterious foundations that transmitted the CIA money, are a group of regional labor institutes financed mainly by AID and operated by AFL-CIO."

Would you comment upon Mr. Dudman's observations?

Mr. MEANY. Well, let me say at the outset, that the AFL-CIO has never received any money in any form from the CIA. This is an accusation which had been made by certain representatives of certain unions, widespread around the world. It has never been established as being true, and I can say to you categorically now that it is not true and under no circumstances have we ever received or solicited any money from the CIA. We do not spend CIA money.

The CHAIRMAN. These articles do not say that the AFL-CIO received it.

Mr. MEANY. What is that?

The CHAIRMAN. They do not say the AFL-CIO received it. The AFL-CIO did not receive the money we were speaking of a moment ago. It goes to AID.

Mr. MEANY. Let me state these unions you mentioned have stated just as categorically as I do they did not and do not receive CIA money.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of this article is that some of the activities carried on in the foreign field, formerly financed by the CIA, have now been picked up by the AID, through its financing of the AIFLD. Is that true or not true, the charge is not that the CIA gave any money to the AFL-CIO?

Mr. MEANY. It is true that the unions which you refer to and which are involved in this million and a half dollar subcontract—that these are carried out by organizations that are members of the AFL-CIO and under the direction of the AIFLD. That is true. But it is not true that this was picked up, as this writer says, to take the place of moneys that were formerly channeled into this area by the CIA. As far as we are concerned that is not true.

The CHAIRMAN. I would put, in order that the record be clear, both articles, from the St. Louis Post Dispatch into the record at this point.

(The articles referred to follow:)

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Apr. 13, 1969]

AID FUNDS FOR CIA PROJECTS

(By Richard Dudman, Chief Washington Correspondent of the Post-Dispatch)

WASHINGTON, April 12—The Agency for International Development has picked up the tab for some of the "CIA orphans," the overseas programs that used to be financed secretly by the Central Intelligence Agency.

The new conduits, taking the place of the mysterious foundations that transmitted the CIA money, are a group of regional labor institutes financed mainly by AID and operated by the AFL-CIO.

As a result, United States Government funds continue to flow into such international labor enterprises as developing an oil workers' federation in Japan, financing a retail clerks' union office in Peru and buying membership buttons for a labor union in The Congo.

Technically, there is no secret about the new financial arrangement. Although there has been no voluntary explanation, either to Congress or to the public, officials readily answer questions about it in the greatest detail. They plan also to describe the setup in presenting the new AID fund request next month to Congress.

HIDDEN SUBSIDIES BANNED

The change apparently grew out of President Lyndon B. Johnson's order of March 29, 1967, prohibiting any further hidden subsidies to private voluntary organizations. He promised to give serious consideration to a proposal that the Federal Government develop and establish "a public-private mechanism to provide public funds openly for overseas activities of organizations which are adjudged deserving, in the national interest, or public support."

A panel headed by former Secretary of State Dean Rusk recommended stopgap assistance for a few such organizations last May, but left the question of permanent financing to the new Administration.

Financing of the international labor programs through the AFL-CIO outlets with AID funds apparently is part of that stopgap plan.

This program, begun in 1968 with a little more than \$1,000,000 annually, was planned in meetings of AID and AFL-CIO officers held earlier last year.

Ernest S. Lee, assistant director of the AFL-CIO's Department of International Affairs, made a formal proposal in a letter May 15, 1968, to Rutherford M. Poats, deputy administrator of AID.

Lee is a son-in-law of George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, and assistant to Jay Lovestone, who helped labor unions spend CIA money in the cold war rivalry after World War II and who still rules the labor federation's international activities.

Lee asked AID to provide \$1,300,000 by expanding existing contracts with the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), the African-American Labor Center (AACL) and the Asian-American Free Labor Institute (AAFLI).

AIFLD, founded in 1962, already has received \$23,000,000 from AID to support organizational and political activities, construction of workers' housing and other programs through most of Latin America. It received more than \$8,000,000 last year alone.

The two newer organizations do similar work in Africa and Asia, respectively. AALC and AAFLI each received about \$1,000,000 for regular programs.

The executive director of AALC, the institute working in Africa, is Irving Brown, who developed a close relationship with Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey and who worked as Lovestone's agent after World War II to set up unions in Germany, France and Italy as rivals for Communist-dominated unions.

Lee's plan, which eventually was adopted, was that AID would use the three institutes as "instruments to provide financial support to American labor organizations" in developing and strengthening free trade unions throughout the world.

SCHEDULE OF SUBCONTRACTS

His proposed schedule of subcontracts called for \$300,000 each to be funneled into the Retail Clerks International Association, the International Federation of Petroleum and Chemical Workers and the Communications Workers of America and \$100,000 into the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks. All are American labor unions as he described them.

Lee proposed that an additional \$200,000 be routed through the institutes directly to groups of unions overseas, without reference to any American unions. Those groups were the Clothing and Textile workers unions, Entertainment Workers Unions and Food, Drink and Plantation Workers Unions. An additional \$100,000 was requested for administrative and supervisory travel.

As the financing has developed, certain readjustments have been made and the current total through next June is \$1,245,000.

AAFLI has been slow getting started. Aside from its work in South Vietnam, where it supports the Vietnamese Confederation of Labor, it has only submitted a \$425,000 proposal, yet to be approved, for the Philippines.

The pattern of financing follows closely a plan proposed and actually applied for a short time to support overseas work by the American Newspaper Guild, which also had been financed by the CIA until a flurry of exposures two years ago.

When the CIA's role was revealed, the Guild could get no satisfactory answers from the foundations that had been supporting its overseas work and which were reported to be conduits for CIA money—the Granary Fund, the Andrew Hamilton Fund, the Chesapeake Foundation, the Broadhigh Foundation and the Warden Trust.

The Guild's board, declaring that this left a shadow over its international affairs program, directed its officers to sever all connection with the funds.

In an effort to keep up the program, the guild obtained a temporary grant from AFL-CIO emergency funds and additional assistance from AIFLD. Meany at one point told the Guild officers that permanent financing could best be obtained from AID through AIFLD, AALC and a third regional institute soon to be created. This was AAFLI, the third institute now being used for the pass-through financing of the other union programs overseas.

But permanent arrangements for the guild never developed. Its officers were told that funds were being curtailed and nothing would be available for the Guild. Some of them concluded that their independence of Lovestone and of official United States policies made them unacceptable for Government subsidy.

"The Guild just didn't fit the mold," one officer said. "It was more concerned with wages and hours and conditions of employees and less concerned with political intrigue."

The Guild's overseas program, which included seminars for foreign journalists and union organizing activities, has since been dismantled.

When the disclosures of two years ago ripped the cover off the secret CIA subsidies of the American people-to-people diplomacy, the world suddenly learned that many of the publications, orchestra tours, magazines, international conferences and workers' forums actually had been made possible by Government

undercover funds. President Johnson chose to order an end to secret financing rather than looking for new secret conduits.

Authorities differ over the further questions of whether voluntary organizations can function effectively with any Government subsidy, covert or overt. Particularly in the case of unions, there are those who believe both credibility and integrity suffer. They point out that AIFLD has slavishly followed U.S. policy on such issues as the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic, where many local unionists and even many Peace Corps volunteers were bitterly opposed to U.S. policy.

The prosubsidy argument, of course is that adequate funds are not available elsewhere. If the Government does not pay the bill no one will.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Apr. 14, 1969]

CHANNEL TO OVERSEAS LABOR

(By Richard Dudman, Chief Washington Correspondent of the Post-Dispatch)

WASHINGTON, April 14.—President Richard M. Nixon is accepting a formula, set up under the previous Democratic Administration, for using the AFL-CIO as the Government's chief channel for labor activities overseas.

In addition to taking advantage of a world-wide network of agents and organizers, the Republican President is also picking up some problems.

There was an atmosphere of doubt and apprehension when George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, called the Labor Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance to order last November 12, the week after the Republican victory.

He boasted about the achievements of the American Institute of Free Labor Development (AIFLD), of which he is president. He cited its efforts in education, housing and other programs. He said that the AFL-CIO planned to continue those efforts in any case, but would prefer to have continued co-operation from the United States Government, meaning that he wanted the United States to continue paying 90 per cent of the bill.

Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, and AIFLD's secretary-treasurer, called for the committee to indorse the "uniquely successful activities" of AIFLD and the AFL-CIO's two other regional institutes, the African-American Labor Center (AALC) and the Asian-American Free Labor Institute (AAFLI).

Beirne recalled that, although AIFLD was not organized until 1962, it had received "significant impetus" from the Eisenhower Administration when Robert B. Murphy, then under secretary of state, backed a precursor and provided foreign aid funds for a trade union training course sponsored by the Communications Workers.

Under the Democrats, the United States put \$23,000,000 into AIFLD and an additional \$1,000,000 each into AALC and AAFLI. The Government also had arranged quietly to channel \$1,250,000 more through the three institutes into overseas labor union activities, picking up in part the old Central Intelligence Agency secret subsidies that were uncovered and suspended two years ago.

By the time the labor advisory committee met again on March 10, much of the doubt had been dispelled. George P. Delaney, the State Department's international labor affairs co-ordinator, reported that the new administrator of the Agency for International Development, John A. Hannah, had a favorable attitude toward labor's programs and that labor would have a "friend in court" in the Nixon Administration. Meany observed that he knew Hannah personally and would enjoy working with him again.

Members of the committee learned further that President Nixon had written to AIFLD's board chairman, J. Peter Grace, president of W. R. Grace & Co., that he was much interested in AIFLD's work and looked forward to continued co-operation toward common goals.

Gerard P. O'Keefe, acting director of AAFLI, said jokingly that after hearing about Mr. Nixon's interest in AIFLD and AALC, AAFLI, as "number three" would have to try harder to attract his attention toward Asia.

The group took note of some of the problems that confronted the government subsidized overseas labor activity.

Indonesia and Venezuela both had decided to throw the subsidized program out entirely, apparently with the concurrence of the United States embassies in the two countries.

Relations with Peru were heading for a climax in which it appeared that the United States would have to cut off all economic aid in retaliation against the seizure of properties of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. A legal opinion had held that AIFLD's subsidized program would have to be suspended along with the rest. As things turned out, the crisis eased and the aid continued.

In the view of some foreign affairs specialists in and out of government, more serious problems grow out of the close relationship of institutes to the United States Government. Thus, AIFLD supported United States military intervention in the Dominican Republic and helped overthrow the government of President Joao Goulart in Brazil, opening the way for the present military dictatorship.

In Colombia AIFLD insisted on applying its own strict standards to a workers' housing project that it built and would not admit any applicant that is considered to be a Communist.

Ambassadors frequently complain that they have little or no control over the operations of the three institutes and that the institutes insist on complete jurisdiction for all United States operations in the labor field. Liaison between the institutes and the Government is through the office of Jay Lovestone, the AFL-CIO's director of international affairs, who has a substantial veto over selection of embassy labor attaches.

The relationship sometimes is a convenient one for the government. The labor advisory committee heard approvingly that a strike against an American firm in Vietnam should be settled in a few days in view of the excellent relationship between the Vietnamese labor confederation and the Saigon government. The confederation, in turn, received financial help from the United States through AAFLI.

That relationship may have helped keep the war going without interruption, but it hardly was a sign of independent union activity that can win the respect of independent nationalists.

REGIONAL ACTIVITIES IN INDONESIA AND VENEZUELA

The CHAIRMAN. There are several excerpts from these articles that are relevant to statements made by Mr. Meany in his principal presentation.

For example, it says "The group (Labor Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance) took note of some of the problems that confronted the Government-subsidized overseas labor activity." It continues, "Indonesia and Venezuela both had decided to throw the subsidized program out entirely, apparently with the concurrence of the U.S. embassies in the two countries."

Is it true that these activities were stopped in Indonesia and Venezuela or not?

Mr. MEANY. The activities were not started in Indonesia. We intended to establish the office of the Asian Institute in Indonesia, but we never started there because the Government position was they did not want outsiders in their country operating this sort of thing.

Insofar as Venezuela is concerned this is not true. As I mentioned in my testimony, we are now building a large workers' housing project in Venezuela which is now going on. The first drawdown of the mortgage money of \$2,800,000 of American trade union money was only taken just a short time back. This is a \$6 million loan. So we are operating in Venezuela as well as all of the other Latin American countries except Haiti, Paraguay, and Cuba.

We wanted to establish our Asian Institute office in Indonesia, and the Indonesian Government said that they did not want an outside organization so we never have had any projects in Indonesia of the AAFLI.

The CHAIRMAN. In an official report to the committee dated July 8, 1969, from the Department of State, there is this passage:

According to the latest available information the program is being phased out as of June 30, 1969, unless a reversal is decided upon. The Caracas evaluation states: "The Mission and Desk feel there is no need for AIFLD staff after January 1969, and recommended that the program director position be left vacant and that the AIFLD office be closed. This is based on possibilities of AIFLD political involvement which has already caused some talk."

That is not a staff report; that is the official report from the Department of State.

Mr. MEANY. Well, I don't know what the background of that is. I do know we have been operating in Venezuela, and I do know that we are operating with the cooperation of all the free unions in Venezuela. Of course, there are rival groups just as there are in the United States, but we have nothing to do with their internal politics. We operate with any free union, we bring students up from all these unions concerned, we can show this in the record, and whatever we offer one group in the way of assistance in housing or cooperatives or establishing any sort of credit unions we offer the other groups.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Meany, it is difficult for me to follow whether you are talking about what the AFL-CIO is doing or the AIFLD.

Mr. MEANY. I am talking about what the AIFLD is doing.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, according to the proposal for 1970 for Venezuela there is nothing proposed in the way of funds for that program in fiscal year 1970 which concerns—

Mr. MEANY. That could be, but I am saying to you we have been working there for some years, and if the political situation is such that the State Department feels that we should not work there that is perfectly all right with us. But we are working there now, and we are engaged in building a large housing project at this very moment with American trade union money. Now, what next year brings, if the situation in Venezuela is politically explosive, and I am sure that all the unions are deeply involved with various political parties, perhaps the State Department feels that under these circumstances there should not be any more operations there, that is their decision and that is all right with us. But they have not conveyed that decision to us as far as I know as of today.

TRAINING OF BRAZILIAN TRADE UNIONISTS

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Meany, do you know Mr. William Doherty?

Mr. MEANY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he director of the Social Projects Department?

Mr. MEANY. Yes, he was. Today he is the executive director of the AIFLD.

The CHAIRMAN. In a panel discussion on July 12, 1964, on the Mutual Broadcasting System the following exchange took place between Mr. H. Conn, the editor of Press Associations, Inc., and Mr. Doherty, then director of the Social Projects Department of the American Institute for Free Labor Development, and the administrator of the institute's entire operation. Mr. Conn made this statement:

Mr. Doherty, this may be just a drop in the bucket, but I know that there has been a number of Brazilian trade unionists who have come up here for training classes conducted by the AIFLD, and I believe there have been some schools in Brazil, have there not? What has happened to these individuals who learned the techniques and the programs of free trade unionism, in recent developments?

DOHERTY. Well, very frankly, within the limits placed upon them by the Administration of Joao Goulart, when they returned to their respective countries, they were very active in organizing workers, and helping unions introduce systems of collective bargaining, and modern concepts of labor-management relations. As a matter of fact, some of them were so active that they became intimately involved in some of the clandestine operations of the revolution before it took place on April 1. What happened in Brazil on April 1 did not just happen—it was planned—and planned months in advance. Many of the trade union leaders—some of whom were actually trained in our institute—were involved in the revolution, and in the overthrow of the Goulart regime.

In Brazil itself, we have the Cultural Workers Institute, with headquarters in Sao Paulo. It has been operating for some two years under the able leadership of both American and Brazilian trade union leaders. It has successfully trained more than 12,000 Brazilian trade union leaders from all walks of life, and in all unions, and they are exercising increasing influence in favor of democratic trade union developments, and in the democratic development of Brazil.

In effect, Mr. Doherty, is taking partial credit for the revolution in Brazil which instituted one of these military dictatorships which you deplored in your statement, isn't he?

MR. MEANY. Well, I would not say Mr. Doherty has taken any credit in that statement. I think he was answering a question and answering it truthfully. When we graduate these people and send them back to their own country we have no guarantee that they will not take part in some sort of a movement to change the form of government, and I am sure they were under very heavy restrictions under the Goulart setup and possibly some of them were part of the movement to overthrow Mr. Goulart, I do not know. We have no way of knowing.

After all we can't get any pledge from them that they will not engage in politics in their own country. That would be completely ridiculous.

THE CHAIRMAN. Well, you may not know but Mr. Doherty says he knew, he took credit for it. He says—

MR. MEANY. I don't think he took credit for it. He said he knew they were part of it. So perhaps he did know it. What has that got to do with the work of the institute?

THE CHAIRMAN. Well, it would indicate that the institute undertakes to train revolutionary—

MR. MEANY. Oh, no, no; that is completely wrong.

THE CHAIRMAN. To participate.

MR. MEANY. The institute is certainly not trying to train revolutionaries. We can show you the curriculum, we can show you the people from the academic world who participate in our work.

However, it is not surprising that a person who would be interested in a trade union would be also interested in establishing some kind of a free government in his own country. But we have no control over that. We cannot tell these people that they must not be politically active. That is entirely up to themselves. All we want to do is to give them a certain amount of knowledge as to how our economy operates in this country, and how our trade union operates with the hope that they will be able to use that knowledge to advance the society and the conditions of the workers in the society where they live. Now, if they want to engage in other outside political activities, Mr. Chairman, we have got no way of guaranteeing they won't do that.

IMPLICATION THAT AIFLD ENGAGED IN TRAINING REVOLUTIONARIES

The CHAIRMAN. Are you familiar with that article in the Reader's Digest—called, "Labor's New Weapon for Democracy," by Eugene Methvin?

Mr. MEANY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not familiar with it?

Mr. MEANY. No; I cannot keep track of them all any more than you can keep track of the people who comment on the work of this committee. I mean I cannot keep track of that. I am familiar with the St. Louis Post-Dispatch business.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the implications are quite clear in the article that the AIFLD is engaged in training, you might say, counter-revolutionists.

Mr. MEANY. That is just not so, Mr. Chairman, and we can prove that that is not so. We have got our whole curriculum here, we have got the people. Of course, if you strain hard enough to find implications you can find them, I suppose.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the article speaks for itself. I will put it in the record, perhaps the author may not be reliable. I really don't know whether Mr. Methvin—

Mr. MEANY. I do not know whether he is reliable or not. I know he is no friend of mine.

(The article referred to follows:)

[Reprint from the Reader's Digest, October 1966]

LABOR'S NEW WEAPON FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Eugene H. Methvin)

While he was attending an International Labor Union convention in Peru in 1958, Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America (CWA), was appalled by the abject poverty he saw everywhere. After watching a six-year-old child hungrily devour a fistful of roots he had just snatched from a grazing llama, Beirne resolved to do something about it. Winging homeward over the Andes, he asked himself, "What can American unions do to help?"

It was clear to Joe Beirne that most of Latin America's 14 million organized workers needed help—collective bargaining was unknown in many industries; working conditions were set by parliaments, and unions traditionally sought their raises by rioting and creating widespread chaos at great cost to general living standards. There were few trained, full-time union organizers, and democratic grievance procedures, the backbone of U.S. unionism, were virtually unknown. "The least we can do is help these people share the benefits of our own experience," Beirne decided.

From this resolve has grown the American Institute for Free Labor Development, an AFL-CIO worker-to-worker educational effort which today, although only four years old, is promoting democratic union methods, economic growth and political reform throughout Latin America. With headquarters in Washington, AIFLD presently operates a full-time training school in Virginia, plus 11 trade-union education centers in Latin capitals serving 9 countries. More than 49,000 Latin union members have attended the field programs, and 500 of the most outstanding graduates have taken the three-month advanced course in the United States. AIFLD has helped Latin unionists to build housing cooperatives and to start credit unions, worker banks, consumer and producer cooperatives, medical clinics, a vocational school, and rural leadership and development programs.

Approach to Big Business. Joe Beirne launched his program on an experimental basis in the summer of 1959 by bringing 19 leaders of Latin unions affiliated with the Postal, Telegraph and Telephone International trade-union secretariat to the CWA education center at Front Royal, Va., for a three-month study confer-

ence. Here they were exposed to U.S. trade-union techniques; then they were sent back to their own countries for nine months of full-time union service, supported by the CWA. The results in more collective-bargaining contracts, better wages and more dues-paying members were so impressive that the AFL-CIO in 1960 gave Beirne \$20,000 to plan a new training institute for the labor-education needs of all Latin unions.

From the start, one of the most important things AIFLD had to teach its students was how to compete successfully against communist professionals trained behind the Iron Curtain in "class struggle" dogma and hate-propaganda techniques. One lesson, Beirne believed, would be a solid demonstration of democratic labor-management cooperation. Couldn't American business be persuaded to join in sponsoring the new institution? Some unionists objected: "The communists will only accuse us of being 'running dogs for the imperialists.'" But AFL-CIO president George Meany thought Beirne's idea had merit; so he and Beirne flew to New York to lay the case before a number of U.S. companies operating in Latin America.

"Management has as much interest in free unions as we have," they urged. "When Henry Ford offered that \$5-a-day wage, he was accused of treason. Instead, he unleashed buying power that revolutionized American capitalism. We want you to help us export this mass-marketing revolution through militant but democratic trade-unionism."

So persuasive were they that today W. R. Grace & Co., the Anaconda Co., Pan American World Airways, International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. and 58 other business concerns contribute to the AIFLD budget. President Kennedy sealed the symbolic partnership by ordering further help from foreign-aid funds.

Playing Roles. Classes started in 1962 with 40 students, a four-man faculty and a few tables and chairs in a former store a few blocks from AFL-CIO headquarters in Washington. From the start, the AIFLD drilled its students far beyond mere textbook study. I sat through several "role-play" sessions with William C. Doherty, Jr., the get-things-done Irishman who now directs the AIFLD. "Our students act out problem situations so they'll be ready to handle real union problems when they go home," Doherty told me.

I watched a Peruvian *campesino* explain to an "obstinate landowner" how profit sharing would give his workers greater interest in increased productivity. I heard a young Jamaican dockworker present to "company negotiators" the case for an employee-run credit union. Another session rehearsed a meeting of auto workers, wherein "Red infiltrators" were trying to divert matters to political ends. "You are a puppet of Yankee imperialists trained in Washington!" shouted planted hecklers at Juan, the Argentine chairman. "American workers are the highest paid in the world under the free enterprise system of class cooperation," Juan shot back. "And what did you communists learn in Cuba? How to reduce living standards by 15 percent in five years? How to destroy free unions and replace them with government bosses and forced labor? Is that how you plan to 'emancipate the working class'? If that's the best you have to offer, take your doctrines back to Moscow—or is it Peking you're taking orders from this week?"

The students not only learn about free unionism in classrooms: they see it in practice. Educational director Sam Haddad arranges regular field trips. On one he took them to a factory in his old Pennsylvania territory where members of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union were packaging shirts. Each woman pressed and folded so rapidly that the Latin visitors were amazed. "This must be a sweatshop!" they exclaimed. "Why doesn't the union protest?"

"Because," said Haddad, "the women get a good basic salary but they also get a piecework bonus and a share of the company's profits at the end of the year. So the more they produce, the more they earn."

A Trip With Justo. To see how the AIFLD spreads trade-union education to the remotest corners of the hemisphere, come with Justo Canaviri, a 32-year-old Urho Indian in Bolivia and a graduate of the AIFLD resident course in La Paz. Justo leads a four-man team into an isolated village 14,000 feet up on the high, windswept Altiplano. Every day for a week, they gather 30 farm workers—members of the local farmers' organization—into a semi-circle on the mountainside to demonstrate simple bookkeeping and explain democratic union practices and free elections. "Your leaders are your servants," Justo emphasizes—a principle new to these feudal tribesmen. "You elect them to serve your needs and, if you don't like what they do, you can elect new leaders. They are your spokesmen, but not your bosses."

Then, selecting peasant-students to play the roles of chairman and officers, they work through a parliamentary session on their village's farm economy—berries, potatoes, grain, llamas and alpacas. These villagers have been carrying their crops by packhorse down the mountain to a middleman with a truck, who pays two dollars a bag, trucks the crop 60 miles, sells it for \$4.50 a bag and pockets a profit greater than the *campesinos* get for growing, picking and packing. Justo shows them how they can create a marketing cooperative, increase their bargaining power and more than double their income.

After a week Justo's team moves on to another area, lecturing in the native Aymará and Quechua dialects. Through field training courses like these, AIFLD has reached 49,000 workers in factories and on farms of Latin America since January 1963.

For another union breakthrough, come to Paysandú, Uruguay's second industrial city, where Angel Ruiz Barreta, 27, presides over a 100-man bakery-workers local. For many years Paysandú bakeries refused to pay union wages. After learning about cooperative principles in the AIFLD Montevideo center, Angel decided to start a worker-owned producers' cooperative. He and five other bakers each put up \$25 and began baking bread. Today their co-op owns three bakeries and three trucks, employs 25 bakers, has paid off a \$10,000 loan and produces the best bread bargain in town.

SPREADING "PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM"

Equally impressive is the way AIFLD is reaching Latins through such pioneering efforts as worker banks. Says Doherty, "We Americans enjoy such widespread savings and credit institutions that we can't imagine what credit means to a Latin worker. He does not dare enter a bank. The great marble buildings and brass doors frighten him. Nor would he be likely to get a loan if he could summon the courage to ask. So he borrows from the factory loan shark who stands at the plant gate on Monday, advances \$5 and gets \$10 back on Friday."

To smash this vicious racket, AIFLD graduates and social-projects experts in July 1964 created a union alliance in Lima, Peru, to form a savings-and-loan association modeled after ones in the United States. Lima workers, knowing their own union leaders were on the board of directors, took their meager savings from stocks, mattresses and tin cans and deposited them in the bank. Today more than 300 families live in homes financed by the association, and more new homes are on the way. The association employs engineers who help borrowers build better houses for less money. AIFLD is now organizing or considering worker banks in Colombia, Venezuela, Argentina and Nicaragua.

Battling the reds

To win time for its reforms to work, AIFLD graduates in some countries must wage daily battles against trained communists. In 1963, for instance, Reds were gaining control of many of Brazil's strategic unions. Alarmed by the trend, Romulo Marinho, secretary of the Brazilian labor federation, went to Washington to study at the AIFLD school, then set up courses throughout Brazil for his own Telegraph Workers Union. Constantly, he taught what Red totalitarianism means, how communists infiltrate and control unions, and what must be done to stop them. After every class he quietly warned key workers of coming trouble and urged them to keep communications going no matter what happened.

Then, in April 1964, middle-class and labor groups, backed by democratic army leaders, moved to oust fellow-traveling President João Goulart.¹ The communists, confident of their iron grip, called a general strike, with emphasis upon communications workers. But to their dismay, the wires kept humming, and the army was able to coordinate troop movements that ended in the showdown bloodlessly. The new military regime promptly appointed four AIFLD graduates to clean out the Red-dominated unions and restore democratic processes. Today, with the military rulers clinging to their authoritarian powers, the AIFLD-trained leaders have broken with them and are seeking a return to democracy.

What is the future of unionism in Latin America? "The thousands of little skirmishes that don't get in the newspapers will decide this issue," says AFL-CIO President Meany. "U.S. unions know that dictatorships of whatever stripe must control the means of production. This means labor loses its freedom first. That's why we're proud, through the AIFLD, to fight beside our Latin American brothers wherever they struggle to defeat tyranny and build better lives for themselves."

¹ See "The Country That Saved Itself," the Reader's Digest, November 1964.

Says Samuel F. Pryor, Jr., retired vice president of Pan American World Airways, "Never before have labor, business and government joined together to advance the cause of organized labor. The results have been beyond all expectations."

Senator CASE. Mr. Chairman, it sounds a little bit as though you were damning this outfit for being revolutionary and counterrevolutionary at the same time.

[Laughter.]

AID SUPPORT OF AFL-CIO ACTIVITIES QUESTIONED

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the point I am trying to bring out is whether this kind of activity is really the proper responsibility of the AFL-CIO. For AID to support an activity which would appear to be engaged in this kind of counterrevolutionary movement is a very dangerous thing, I believe, for the interests of this country, and may get us into very great difficulties.

I think today, surely, we all admit after the recent experiences of the Governor of New York, if the administration did not know before that our relations in Latin America are in a deplorable state, it should now. They are worse than they have been in my memory. I was greatly embarrassed by the reception that one of our most distinguished Governors and a man who has a long reputation of trying to improve relations with Latin America received, with the exception of Haiti. His reception indicates that what we have been doing in Latin America is not the right thing. I do not mean to say that the AIFLD is responsible for all of that but Mr. Doherty seems to take credit for part of it, at least, in his statement. I am raising the question whether or not it is a good investment of public moneys to foster the kind of institutes which we have fostered to the tune of some \$28 million. That is the question at issue. I am not sure that they are really competent to become embroiled in the internal politics of Latin America where we are having very grave difficulties there.

Mr. MEANY. Mr. Chairman, we are not embroiled in the politics of Latin American countries, and if you make a deduction that because some students who after graduation went back to their own countries and became involved in revolutionary activities that this reflects on AIFLD, it has nothing to do with AIFLD. We have no way of controlling these people. We get them recommended from the trade unions, they are recommended by Latin American trade unionists and people from the Latin American academic community to come up here as students, and we train them, and we send them back, and we ask them to spend their time, they spend the first 9 months after they get back, we can be sure of this, they spend the first 9 months after they get back, instructing other people in our branch institutes in Latin America. What they do after that 9 months is over I cannot say but if they join some political party that is against some regime in power, I think it is stretching your imagination quite a bit if you are going to attribute that to what the AIFLD had done while they were up here. To me that is just completely ridiculous.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I do not know, I think what a student does after he graduates often reflects, if the educational institution is effective at all, what he has been taught, either that or your educational institution is a total failure.

Mr. MEANY. Mr. Chairman, if what you say is true we would have to close all the universities in America.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not quite follow that.

Mr. MEANY. Well, you say an institution that trains them has got to be responsible for what they do after that, that is nonsense.

The CHAIRMAN. I think, on the whole, the institutions in America can be proud of what they do.

Mr. MEANY. Just as we are proud of what we are doing in Latin America.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I think the relationship there speaks for itself. I am not manufacturing it. I think you will have to admit that our relations are at a very low ebb at the moment. I don't know how else you would explain the experiences of Governor Rockefeller who I certainly do not believe personally inspired those demonstrations. It is because of their attitude toward our country.

ALLEGED LABOR SUPPORT OF ADMINISTRATION

Now, with regard to one other matter you mentioned which you seem to feel very strongly about, I want to read from the minutes of the 20th meeting, January 8, 1968, of the Labor Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance. This took place at the AFL-CIO building here in Washington, D.C. The Labor Advisory Committee has Mr. George Meany as its chairman, and, of course, AFL-CIO president. Mr. John J. Grogan, I won't name them all, I will put them all in the record, and the Department of State was represented by Mr. William Bundy, Mr. Joseph Palmer and a number of others; Department of Labor was represented, and AID was represented by Mr. Gaud, and Mr. Bullitt, and so forth.

I read this to indicate that perhaps some of those suggestions that I made were not entirely without foundation.

Mr. Meany announced that a letter of intent had been prepared confirming agreement between the AFL-CIO and AID for the establishment of the Asian-American Free Labor Institute to help the Vietnamese Confederation of Labor (CVT). Creation of this new instrumentality was one of the recommendations of the recent AFL-CIO Mission to Vietnam that included Vice Presidents Keeney and Walsh as well as Irving Brown and Phil Delaney. This I think is significant. "Mr. Gaud"—who at that time was the director of AID—"thanked Mr. Meany for the fine reception he received at the AFL-CIO Convention and described it as a highly significant meeting. He outlined the problems that AID is presently wrestling with in adjusting its program to conform to the drastically reduced appropriations granted by the Congress

So Mr. Gaud was very appreciative of the fine reception.

Then later in the same meeting—

Mr. MEANY. We give everybody good receptions at our conventions, Mr. Chairman, not only Mr. Gaud.

The CHAIRMAN. Mentioned later at the same meeting was Mr. William Bundy who, as the Assistant Secretary of the East Asian Bureau, was directly responsible in the Department of State for our policy in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Bundy outlined in detail the background and implications of United States-Cambodian relations that surrounded Ambassador Bowles' visit to that country. He analyzed the "peace feelers" that have recently emanated from Hanoi. He

thanked Mr. Meany for the strong resolution of support for U.S. policy in Vietnam adopted at the AFL-CIO convention and mentioned that a somewhat similar resolution was passed by BATU, the Asian affiliate of IFCTU.

Well, I think that shows a very cordial understanding, and I, therefore, think it is not out of order to say that the support of the AFL-CIO was part of the understanding between yourself and the administration.

(The list referred to follows:)

LABOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE, MINUTES OF 20TH MEETING, JANUARY 8, 1968, AFL-CIO BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C.

ATTENDANCE

Labor Advisory Committee:

George Meany, president, AFL-CIO, chairman.
 John J. Grogan, president, Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers.
 P. L. Siemiller, president, International Association of Machinists.
 Joseph D. Keenan, secretary, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
 William C. Doherty, Jr., administrator, American Institute for Free Labor Development.
 W. A. Boyle, president, United Mine Workers of America.
 Jay Lovestone, director, Department of International Affairs, AFL-CIO.
 Ernest S. Lee, assistant director, Department of International Affairs, AFL-CIO.
 Andrew C. McLellan, inter-American representative, AFL-CIO.
 Jesse A. Friedman, associate inter-American representative, AFL-CIO.

Department of State:

Joseph Palmer, secretary, Bureau of African Affairs.
 William Bundy, assistant secretary, East Asia Bureau.
 George P. Delaney, Special Assistant to the Secretary and Director, Office of Labor Affairs, AID.
 Arnold L. Zempel, Deputy coordinator of International Labor Affairs.
 Alvin M. Rucker, labor adviser, AFI.
 Howard Robinson, labor adviser, EA.
 Thomas E. Walsh, adviser, ARA-LA.

Department of Labor:

George L-P Weaver, Assistant Secretary for International Affairs.
 Henry S. Hammond, ARA specialist, ILAB.

A.I.D.:

William S. Gaud, Administrator.
 John C. Bullitt, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for East Asia.
 James P. Grant, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Vietnam.
 Robert Smith, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Africa.
 Clifford C. Matlock, Director, EA/TECH.
 Kenneth J. Kelley, Deputy Director, Office of Labor Affairs.
 Edward Wiesinger, Labor Adviser, AFR/ID.
 Paul Schuler, Labor Adviser, EA/TECH.
 Harold S. Kaufman, Labor Adviser, LA/ID.
 Roger Burgess, Labor Adviser, VN/PEP.
 Graham McKelvey, Program Coordinator, O/LAB.

African-American Labor Center: Dean Clowes, deputy director.

The CHAIRMAN. I notice Mr. Lovestone's name appears in a number of places—

Mr. MEANY. Mr. Chairman, I think you are laboriously trying to reach a conclusion to justify your very unjustified remarks of the other day. When you spoke about a payoff—

The CHAIRMAN. About what?

AFL-CIO SUPPORT FOR VIETNAM WAR DENIED

Mr. MEANY. A payoff, the AFL-CIO being paid off for support.

As I pointed out in my testimony we had a policy on Vietnam in 1954. Now, who paid us then? Did the Eisenhower administration pay us for that sort of support? Are you saying that Bill Gaud thanked us for the reception and that Bundy thanked us for passing a resolution? Why, I think that is really stretching the imagination to make it appear that there is some kind of arrangement by which we are paid off to support the administration.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't believe I used that exact language.

Mr. MEANY. Oh, yes; you used the exact language when you said this was a payoff for George Meany and AFL-CIO.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't deny the meaning was the same.

Mr. MEANY. And I placed it all on the Staats letter after I spoke to you on the telephone and I reread the Staats letter again and I can't find anything in the Staats letter that indicates anybody was paid off for labor support of the administration.

The CHAIRMAN. No. The Staats letter simply indicates he could find no justification for this expenditure of funds, that is all.

Mr. MEANY. No; he didn't say that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all it indicates.

Mr. MEANY. No; he didn't say that at all. He said he couldn't make a judgment as to the relative success of the program from the viewpoint of U.S. foreign policy.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't see much difference myself.

Mr. MEANY. There is quite a difference. And, however, in the second sentence in that paragraph he indicated a judgment on the work of the AIFLD that was quite favorable. You didn't read that second part of the paragraph, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I read it, those are your intentions.

The words are always very nice in all these programs. What we are interested in is the performance, and judging from the performance that has occurred, the Comptroller General couldn't make a judgment that the program is justified. But he says the purpose and the objective is innovative and imaginative and that is beneficial if it could be performed without becoming embroiled in the internal politics of these various countries.

You say "laborious." It is laborious to read these minutes but I will read another one in any case. These are minutes from your own meetings. These are not my minutes.

Mr. MEANY. These are minutes from a meeting of Government and labor people.

The CHAIRMAN. At which you were chairman.

Mr. MEANY. A committee formed at the suggestion of the Government itself and which contains every segment of the State Department, Asia, Africa, suboffices and so forth and so on, also the Labor Department, so it is not my committee.

The CHAIRMAN. You are the chairman of it.

Mr. MEANY. I am the chairman of it; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the Labor Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance, and you are the chairman of it.

Mr. MEANY. That is right, to advise the U.S. Government, that is what we were set up for, at their request.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe your son-in-law, Mr. Ernest Lee is Assistant Director of the AFL-CIO's Department of International Affairs, is he not?

Mr. MEANY. Yes; he is.

CLOSE WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH STATE DEPARTMENT CHARGED

The CHAIRMAN. And Mr. Lovestone, he doesn't name them all, but they are there, I will read part of the minutes from another meeting. This is the meeting of March 11, 1968:

Chairman Meany reported that the Asian-American Free Labor Institute has been established as a legal entity and is already functioning in Vietnam. Fernand Audie, who will direct the Vietnam program, has had previous experience working with Asian unions and is now in Saigon accompanied by Irving Brown. As a result of a request from Secretary Rusk, the AFL-CIO Executive Council, at its recent meeting, voted to contribute \$35,000 for emergency relief aid in small project equipment to the Vietnamese Federation of Labor. In addition, AFL-CIO affiliates are being asked to give financial assistance to the CVT in its current relief efforts.

Mr. Meany reported that the AFL-CIO has been in consultation with the Department of Defense regarding a revised Labor Ordinance for Okinawa where the AFL-CIO has appointed an Asian field representative to reside at Naha.

But all through this it shows very close working conditions between the AFL-CIO, and the Government, and the State Department.

Later at this same meeting Mr. Poats thanked the AFL-CIO for the kindness and generosity of its assistance to the CVT in Vietnam. AID views the—

Mr. MEANY. You have me blushing.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, your activities seem to be a part of the cold war or the hot war, both.

Mr. MEANY. Our activities in this respect, Mr. Chairman, are part of the activities of our Government. When we sent \$35,000 to Vietnam to buy tractors to help the farmers get their planting in we did that on the theory that we are helping the policies of our own Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Exactly.

Mr. MEANY. When we helped the Vietnamese trade union, which is certainly on our side, we feel we are furthering the policy of our own Government.

The CHAIRMAN. I have no doubt—

Mr. MEANY. If you object to Government people making these requests you had better take it up with the State Department, not with us. We think we are doing what good citizens should do to help their country in these affairs.

REQUEST FOR PRESENT MEETING

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Meany, I was taking it up with the State Department, not you. You asked for this meeting. I wasn't taking it up with you, I was taking it up with the State Department—

Mr. MEANY. Mr. Chairman, let me get the record straight.

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). Objecting to this activity, and I don't think it is your duty to have to play this independent role in our foreign policy.

Mr. MEANY. That is your opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. That is exactly it.

Mr. MEANY. But the administration, the past administration, seemed to feel we had a part to play.

The CHAIRMAN. I agree with that.

Mr. MEANY. As far as my asking for this meeting, I would like to set the record straight. I called you on the telephone Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MEANY. About your statement that there was a payoff. That is what I called you about.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MEANY. And you said "did you read the Staats' letter," and I said "why, I don't know what it has got to do with this," and you asked me then did I want to come before the committee and I said that is not the purpose of my call. I said the purpose of my call, Mr. Chairman, is to get some time with you to try to show you what we are doing in the hopes that you would lose this antagonistic point of view toward us and you at that point said "oh, no, this is not a personal matter. This is a committee matter" so I am here because you wanted me here. I didn't ask to come before this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Why, Mr. Meany, I certainly misunderstood it then.

Mr. MEANY. Well, I want to make that quite clear. In fact I have been 30 years in Washington, and this is the first time I appeared before this committee. This is not an easy committee to get before.

[Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Well, had you ever requested to come before this committee?

Mr. MEANY. Oh, yes; oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have been rejected?

Mr. MEANY. We have made requests and sent letters on different matters and didn't even get an answer on different matters and were told that organizations—

The CHAIRMAN. You have never been before this committee before?

Mr. MEANY. No, I have been before the House Foreign Affairs Committee many, many times, all other committees of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. That is surprising.

Mr. MEANY. This is my first visit and I am quite honored. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Meany, I will be very surprised if you can produce any proof that your request to come before this committee has been rejected. I don't recall any such instance and I won't believe it until you show me the proof.

Mr. MEANY. Well, the answer we invariably got, Mr. Chairman, for private organizations, organizations of private citizens, you would assign 10 minutes, so of course that was a rejection in a way, we thought.

REQUEST TO APPEAR BEFORE MORSE SUBCOMMITTEE

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I don't know. You mean you didn't come under the conditions that others come under. You wanted some special conditions. But the fact of the matter is when you called me and said

you wanted to come and see me about this matter, I said this is a committee matter; that it isn't anything personal. Actually the staff report which you object to, and which is your privilege to object to, I had nothing to do with; that was Senator Morse's subcommittee which had the investigation of activities in Latin America.

Mr. MEANY. Mr. Chairman, I think the material I will—I have presented to you, including the correspondence with Morse, will show that we answered this subcommittee paper, and that we requested a hearing before the subcommittee, and that I have—you will see in Senator Morse's letter that he promised us this particular hearing.

Now, of course, I am not criticizing Senator Morse because I know his election came along, he had a recount that took some time and, of course, finally he lost out and was out of the Senate, but he did promise to give us a hearing to submit our side of this, on this material which was presented in the so-called Dockery report which was a staff document. And what disturbed us was that this was distributed in some way to the press even though it was not a committee document. Even though it had a disclaimer on the first page as not being the work of the committee or not having the approval of the committee, still it was broadcast all over the world as a committee document critical of the AFL-CIO.

As I pointed out, we have responded to every request from the GAO, from the AID or anyone else on our work, and we have presented them with voluminous reports, and we found that the reports and the questions we answered were not reflected in the Dockery report. So, of course, we wanted an opportunity to appear before the committee and set that straight, and we did not get that opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. That was a subcommittee, but you didn't request to come here to the full committee.

Mr. MEANY. No, not here, no, no, the subcommittee. You are right, the subcommittee, not this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The subcommittee of Senator Morse.

I have just been handed a note—I thought I recalled having seen you before this committee—indicating that our records show that you have appeared several times before this committee. You personally appeared on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, and submitted a letter for a hearing on the training of foreign affairs personnel, and on East-West Trade. On numerous occasions as long ago as the 80th Congress, the AFL-CIO has sent a representative. But you have not—

Mr. MEANY. I would like to check that, I have no recollection of it.

DIFFERENCES ARE NOT PERSONAL

The CHAIRMAN. You have not requested to be heard in the way that you called me as you did the other day. I saw no point, on a matter of this kind, of simply having a personal meeting, because there is nothing personal about this difference.

Mr. MEANY. Mr. Chairman, I called you for the purpose of meeting you personally and to try to show you what we were doing because you were the one who said we were being paid off. I didn't hear that from any other committee and I don't know whether the committee

passed on it but you were the one who said we were paid off by the previous administration for our support in Vietnam.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I don't believe I used that word, and if so, I will withdraw the word and put it this way: That there was a very cozy relationship between you and the previous administration by which you were given control over some \$5 million a year to do with as you pleased.

Mr. MEANY. To do as we pleased?

The CHAIRMAN. To implement your policies under the AIFLD.

Mr. MEANY. To do as we pleased? Every step of the way, Mr. Chairman, this was, the money was expended under the supervision of the U.S. Government.

Do you realize what we do in these housing projects, Mr. Chairman? The people that are paid by U.S. Government, not by us—

The CHAIRMAN. I want to read—

Mr. MEANY. Go there to make these feasibility studies. Our part is to bring the union in and our part is to finance the construction when it is finished.

GAO PRELIMINARY DRAFT REPORT

The CHAIRMAN. Let me read you this from a preliminary draft of a GAO report. The GAO is, as you know, an arm of the Congress. This is a draft of a follow-up report of the GAO. I have a good deal here I could read, but this is from only the first page of the summary:

This is the GAO, it is not my review, I will read the first part of this summary:

This is the AIFLD contract activities which I am referring to.

Our review was not designed to reach any specific conclusion on the success or effectiveness of the AIFLD program; however, we believe the AIFLD is making substantial efforts to reach the union members with their message on free labor developments through their educational seminars.

Except for audits of the AIFLD operations by the AID missions, which are generally limited to financial matters, we found that AID has performed little or no evaluation of the AIFLD program. In neither Brazil nor Chile could we find any systematic review being made of the AIFLD program.

Our followup review showed that AIFLD has retained the unusual amount of flexibility that was noted in our prior audit. Although we, as in our prior report, are not indicating that the underlying union-to-union cooperation be changed, we do not feel that a closer cooperation will have to be brought about. Under the present arrangement AIFLD has an almost free hand to do anything it so desires.

Now that is a quote from the draft of the followup report of the GAO.

Mr. MEANY. I would like to get a copy of that report.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me read another excerpt of this particular part.

Mr. MEANY. Is this report public?

The CHAIRMAN (reading):

In view of the weaknesses in internal control of funds of AIFLD field offices we believe AIFLD Washington should clearly set forth procedures necessary to provide financial control and management.

Now that is the draft of the followon report of the GAO, of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. MEANY. Which is critical of AID, I would say, for not—

The CHAIRMAN. I yield.

Mr. MEANY. Can I get a copy of that report?

The CHAIRMAN. That may well be.

Mr. MEANY. I mean if AID—

The CHAIRMAN. AID has—

Mr. MEANY. If AID has not exercised the proper supervision of the finances, don't blame me for that, that is AID's job.

The CHAIRMAN. All I say is you do as you please.

Mr. MEANY. Are you inferring they were afraid to do that because we have such tremendous influence; is that the idea?

The CHAIRMAN. I am only stating that, according to GAO, you do as you please with the money.

Mr. MEANY. That is not so. I don't care, GAO or not, that is not so.

The CHAIRMAN. The GAO said it.

Mr. MEANY. And I don't think that you could substantiate that if you had the AID officials here. I don't think the AID officials would agree to that at all.

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Senator from Missouri.

SUGGESTED SOLUTION TO VIETNAM CONFLICT

Senator SYMINGTON. I have to leave and just want to say I have known Mr. Meany over 40 years, long before he ever became the head of any labor organization and long before I came to Government. He is a good American.

I haven't agreed with him on certain matters, but that is the nature of our country.

In reading over the exhibits, I would ask him in all sincerity about something that is in my own mind and in the minds of many people. Nobody has yet heard me criticize this administration with respect to the Vietnam war, although I earnestly hope, not only because of what it is costing us in the programs we know we need here at home, but also because of the tragedy of losing so many of our finest youth, that it end soon. Thinking about what has happened in these last 15 years not only in Vietnam but all over the world, I would ask the distinguished witness what things we ought to do in Vietnam now? That would be my question.

Mr. MEANY. Well, that is a big question, and I don't feel competent to tell this country what it should do. We have supported the administration's efforts in Vietnam since 1954. I have a speech here—in which I went into our analysis of this at great length—made to the American Legion in August of 1965 and, of course, we would like to see the Vietnam thing brought to a close. We feel that the way to do it is through free elections participated in by both sides in this conflict, and insofar as the military end of it is concerned we are not qualified to tell how this war should be fought.

I do know enough about it to know that this is not the usual type of war that we have read of in history, I mean where you have a battle-front here, a straight line or a line dividing the two sides. It is a different type of war and this is one of the reasons why we are so interested in helping the Vietnamese labor movement.

Now the head of the Vietnamese labor movement has been in this country many times, not as our guest but came here at the request of

the State Department. He met President Kennedy a few years ago, he met President Johnson, he met Secretary Rusk, and they all seemed to agree that the Vietnamese Free Trade Union had a part to play, a very important part to play, in this particular war, especially in the pacification program, the program of trying to free the towns and the villages from the domination of the Vietcong.

This is the reason we helped them build these social centers around Saigon, where the families of these workers could come at certain times in order to be secure and safe.

But, Senator, I have no magic wand nor do I have a crystal ball and I don't know how to end this war, but I know that we are committed to this war and I know that the previous administration, the Johnson administration, the Kennedy administration, and certainly the Eisenhower administration, committed us to this war.

I wish I knew how we could get out of this war with our heads up, I have been fighting Communists for practically all my life, and from everything that I know if we were to unilaterally withdraw this would only be the steppingstone for further aggression.

DOMINO THEORY SUPPORTED

Now, I subscribe to the so-called domino theory which some try to discredit. I don't know who discredited it but from what I have seen these people do that if they could overrun South Vietnam they would not stop there. Laos and Thailand and then what would happen if they moved into the Philippines, could we then say, well, this is none of our business? I didn't make these commitments. My Government made the commitments, and I am supporting my Government. That is the way I look at it. Maybe if I knew as much about it as someone else I wouldn't. But I certainly know as much about it as I could gather and I get all the knowledge I can on it and, as I said before, we made a statement on Vietnam in 1954, and everything we said in 1954 still applies today.

The same proposal we made then could certainly be used there today. We called for free elections, we called for the United Nations intervention, we called for a Pacific peace force under the aegis of the United Nations, so I have no apology to make for my stand on Vietnam. I am supporting my Government.

Now, if my Government is wrong, well, that is perhaps for somebody else to tell them, but this has been our consistent position.

But we do know something about the Communists. We know quite a bit about them. We know how they act, and whether this is cold war or not as far as I am concerned there has been no change in the Communist objective. They haven't changed. They may have changed their methods but they haven't changed their objective, and I think that this country as the most powerful country in the free world must lead the free world. There is nobody else to lead it. Whether we will it or not, we have got to take the leadership of the free world.

So this is our position and if you would like I would give you this copy of a speech I made on Vietnam to the American Legion 4 years ago and I think it represents our policy as of today.

Senator SYMINGTON. I would like to have it, and I would like to read it and I respect your opinion very much. But don't you think that things in the world have changed some since 1954 which might make changes in our overall position?

Mr. MEANY. I think there have been a lot of changes.

Now if you mean by that changes in our overall world position, I think our overall world position is trying to protect the integrity and security of this country.

We have a certain type of society in this country, we have a free society, and I feel that every citizen has a stake in that society. I know that we have, because under this free society, Senator, we have advanced the cause of American workers to a degree beyond that which has happened in any other country of the world. We would like to preserve that type of society. And when we look at what happened in Castro's Cuba, we come to the conclusion if more of this took place and came right up to our borders that our type of society would be in danger.

Now, of course there have been changes. The dispute between the Soviets and the Chinese represents a changing situation, but they do not dispute each other in so far as objective, they both want to communize the world. The Soviets want to do it by infiltration, by intrigue, and the Chinese want to do it immediately by force.

But I thought that there had been some changes. I thought that I would never again see another Budapest, I thought I would never, again see what happened in 1956 in Hungary. I thought I would never see that happen again, but I did see it happen again in August of last year in Czechoslovakia. I thought that there had been a tremendous change in the thinking of the Soviet leadership, their attitude toward their own people had changed.

There is no question the Soviet people are more free today than they were 10 years ago. The education level of the country has come up and the people know more, but the grip of the ruling clique on the people hasn't changed nor has the objective of that clique changed.

So I think we have got to be realistic about this. I think we should seize every opportunity that comes up to try to talk peace, to try to get these things settled, but I don't think we should allow ourselves a false sense of security by seeing a peaceful attitude on the part of the other people just because we want to see that sort of attitude.

I have been around a long time and I don't know any case in this history of relations of free societies and dictatorial countries where the cause of freedom has been advanced by unilateral concessions by the free nations to the dictatorial nations. They tried that with Hitler. They kept conceding and conceding and conceding. It didn't deter him.

As far as dealing with the Soviets, this is something our Government should continue to do, they should continue to search for ways of obtaining peace. But I don't think we should try to indulge ourselves in false self-delusions that they have basically changed. As of now I don't think their objective, their basic objective, has changed. Their methods of achieving that objective have changed but I don't think their objective has.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

May I ask one more question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

WHAT FURTHER CAN UNITED STATES DO IN VIETNAM?

Senator SYMINGTON. I would like to talk to you about this further another time. In my State we are running out of Federal support in some of our essential programs, education of our children, control of our water, control of pollution, water and air, problems of the hard core of the large cities, problems of the farmers; and, above all, the steady depreciation in the value of the dollar. For some, that can be adjusted, but it is hard on those who are inactive, primarily people who are in retirement. I say in all sincerity that I felt the way you did in 1954 when you wrote that speech. My feelings have changed considerably, and that is why I would like to kick it around with you some day.

We are putting now, the best estimate I can make, about \$80 million a day into the Vietnam operation. Senator Aiken, ranking Republican on this committee, a wise man, pointed out that we have had free elections out there, and the elections were satisfactory, and I am wondering just how much more we can do with our increasingly limited resources, especially if this situation develops in other parts of the world.

If you have any thoughts on that I would appreciate hearing them, and in any case would like a chance to talk with you further, because I deeply respect your opinion.

Mr. MEANY. I would be glad to talk to you on that and, Senator, I don't pretend to have the answer to this problem. The cost of maintaining our military establishment practically takes up all of the income taxes, the personal income taxes, that we pay in this country, and surely I would like to see that money spent some other way. I would like to see that money spent to clean up our rivers, to clean up our slums, and do a lot of things.

But, on the other hand, you have the security of the country, and I am not charged with protecting the country. I mean that is not my job. But we elect people who are, and I couldn't make a judgment.

I would like to see the sort of a world where we wouldn't have any Pentagon, where we wouldn't have any military establishment, military-industrial or what have you. But can we pull out of this world, can we isolate ourselves? Is isolation possible in today's world? Can we build a fortress America and live behind it? I don't know, and I wish I did know.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

USE OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS BY AIFLD

The CHAIRMAN. Before we proceed, I would like to try to put this back in perspective in case there is some misunderstanding as to what this hearing is about.

I respect your right as an individual and as president of your organization to feel as you please about these foreign policy matters. The question at issue here really is not how you feel about the war, this

war or any other war on Vietnam; you feel as you please about it. The question is whether or not the Government should turn over money to your organization to use, as the follow-on GAO draft report states, as you wish in Latin America and, I assume, elsewhere, in Asia and Africa, in pursuit of your views. Do you know of any precedent—

Mr. MEANY. Mr. Chairman, can I straighten this out right away?

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I am trying to do. I am not quarreling.

Mr. MEANY. Let me see if I can straighten you out here. I am not here to plead with the Government to continue to give us this money.

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. MEANY. Oh, no; that is not my purpose at all. In my conversation with you this was not mentioned. I was here to try to set you straight, to say that this is not a political payoff as you said it was 2 or 3 weeks ago.

Now, we are in this field. We think that what we do in some way makes a contribution to our country's foreign policy. But if it does not, that is the judgment for somebody else to make. I have nothing to say on it. I will accept the judgment of whatever Government agency is responsible in this field. I am not here pleading for continuation of Government money in this field. We are going to continue in this field whether we have Government money or not. So let us disabuse your mind that I appeared here to try to justify the expenditure of Government money—not in the slightest.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I certainly thought you were here to justify—

Mr. MEANY. You had no reason to think that. I was here to find out why you took the position that we were receiving a political payoff from the previous administration.

The CHAIRMAN. Maybe we are clarifying it. The hearing that this occurred in was the hearing on the foreign aid program. It was not a hearing on the AFL-CIO. It was the foreign aid program, and one item in the foreign aid program is the amounts related to the AIFLD which is in effect directed by you, by the AFL-CIO. It is altogether over \$30 million; the Latin American part of it is \$28 million. So the only question at issue is whether it is wise and in the public interest to do that.

I know of no precedent in which the Government turns over funds to a private organization to use with this degree of freedom in foreign countries. I wonder how you would feel about it if the big labor union in France had local people here in Washington lobbying this committee on our policies about what we should do in Europe. My guess is you would not take well to that at all.

Mr. MEANY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. In effect, that is what the AIFLD has done.

Mr. MEANY. That is complete nonsense, Mr. Chairman. That is not so, and you cannot document that in any way.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I can document it only by these—

Mr. MEANY. These newspaper articles. Good, I will give you newspaper articles that would make you look kind of sick. [Laughter.]

And still I don't believe them.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Meany, you have done your part in trying to do that. Your criticisms of me—

Mr. MEANY. No; I am not—I have not done my part. I came here for one purpose, Mr. Chairman. I called you on the telephone and I said to you that you made a statement that I did not agree with and I thought was unjustified and unfair, and I wanted to explain it to you, I wanted a little of your time, and you said "Oh, this is not a personal matter. This is a committee matter."

The CHAIRMAN. This is correct.

Mr. MEANY. So here I am. But I did not hear other members of the committee accuse us of taking a payoff from the Johnson administration.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, maybe they hadn't studied the record as carefully as I had.

Mr. MEANY. They hadn't. Can you justify that statement from anything you have presented here today?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I think the record shows it pretty clearly.

Mr. MEANY. Yes?

The CHAIRMAN. I think it supports it pretty clearly, and I think—

Mr. MEANY. I do not happen to think so.

EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS IS PUBLIC BUSINESS

The CHAIRMAN. Since you bring it up, you have made many statements far more vicious in their criticism of me than I have ever made of you, and you made them voluntarily without regard to legislation or your duties at all, simply because you took issue with my views.

I was examining a witness with regard to whether or not we should continue to supply money to your organization for the use in these various areas. I think it is the business of this committee, it is not just my business, this is public business. This committee is partially responsible for how this money is spent in the sense that we recommend and pass upon this legislation. It takes the authorization of the Senate of which we are a body, a part, to authorize the expenditure of these funds. This is public business, it is not my private business.

I have differed with you, of course, you have with me, on our private views but I have never made any issue of that. I do not recall that I have ever publicly denounced you in any way as you have me. I never responded to your vicious attacks upon me.

Mr. MEANY. When you said I was receiving a payoff, was that complimentary or was it sort of an adverse criticism?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that was in connection with this hearing, the connection being that it certainly is more, it seems to me, than purely coincidental that this very intimate relationship existed between you and the former administration and the large amount of moneys that have been contributed by the Government to your activity.

But all I wanted to say in your discussion with the Senator from Missouri is that you have every right to say what you like about the war. The question is, should this committee authorize public funds to you to be used in the promotion of your views?

We authorize funds to the State Department to foster our foreign policy, and I know of no precedent in which a private organization similar to yours is likewise given money to go out and to influence governments and to lobby in foreign parliaments and to try to influence foreign policy.

Mr. MEANY. We don't do any of those things and you cannot prove that we do. You are just throwing accusations out in the empty air. We don't influence government and we don't interfere with governments.

The CHAIRMAN. The reports say that you do.

Mr. MEANY. We try to help workers on the theory that by helping workers we can establish sound government which would be in the interests of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The reports don't show that.

Senator CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask some questions.

The CHAIRMAN. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Senator CHURCH. Mr. Meany, the purpose of this hearing is to get out the facts in connection with this program and I think that that is what you are here to do and that is what we are here to find out.

OBJECTIVES OF AIFLD PROGRAM

Let me say, first of all, that as I understand it, you have two interests in connection with this program. One interest is a specific one, that is to foster the development of free trade union movements of the kind that we have had in this country, and to give instruction to union members who come here for that purpose and to return to their own countries to organize and develop a free trade union movement. That is the specific purpose of the program, is it not?

Mr. MEANY. Yes.

Senator CHURCH. And you are also traditionally interested in democratic government? I think that the history of the trade union movement in this country demonstrates that.

Now, I have no quarrel at all with those objectives. I think those are legitimate objectives and I think to the extent you are successful in helping to develop free trade unions I think that will, in turn, make its influence felt in the growth of democratic government, and I think both objectives serve our country and its interests abroad.

SOURCE OF AIFLD FUNDS

The question that I have, and I think we ought to get clear on the record, relates first of all to the financing. It has been said here at this hearing that approximately 90 percent of the money with which the AIFLD is financed comes from the Government, is that correct?

Mr. MEANY. That could be about right.

Senator CHURCH. Now, does it come entirely from AID?

Mr. MEANY. Yes.

Senator CHURCH. And there is none of it, as you have already testified, that comes from the CIA?

Mr. MEANY. No, sir.

Senator CHURCH. All right. Now, where does the rest of it come from?

Mr. MEANY. From the AFL-CIO and from these business corporations that I mentioned: Koppers Co., Standard Oil of New Jersey, United Corp., Mr. David Rockefeller, ITT, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and General Foods.

Senator CHURCH. Altogether these business sources, plus the labor money, has amounted to what, about \$2.5 or \$3.8 million?

Mr. MEANY. Yes. But, Senator, I think you have got to draw a line between the social projects activities of our institute and the educational activities.

The business money and the AFL-CIO money is spent largely on the educational end of the program.

SOCIAL PROJECTS DEPARTMENT

Now, on the social projects, keep this in mind, this social projects department came into being when this country decided they were going to help Latin America through the Alliance for Progress, and we said to President Kennedy "if you give all this money to the established institutions in these countries you will not change the situation." We said we think that we can help in channeling this money into projects that are beneficial for workers.

Now, you take a housing project, Senator, you have all sorts of people. It takes 10 months or 11 months or sometimes 12 months, to finish a feasibility study for a housing project. All of these technical people, architects, land experts, water experts, experts in design and maintenance and so on and so forth, these people are sent down there, and they are paid by the U.S. Government, through contract with AIFLD.

This is where this money goes. This is money that the Alliance for Progress has to spend for these purposes. We actually, in effect, introduced to the Alliance for Progress the labor people who have these projects.

Now, we certainly agree or at least we find agreement in AID that all of this money used for the Alliance for Progress should not go to governments, that it should go to the private institutions, and to say that we spent it as we please is complete nonsense. Everyone of these people is subject to Government checks. Their salaries and their expenses are all audited by government, and they are not all labor people, Mr. Chairman. These are technicians, these are architects, land experts, water experts, tax experts, experts in the field of housing.

EDUCATIONAL SIDE OF PROGRAM

Now, in the educational side of this program, I could be wrong in the figures, but my judgment is that this is a tripartite proposition, as far as the money that the AFL-CIO puts in, that private business puts in, and to which the Federal Government makes a contribution. I would say that goes three ways.

Now, in addition to that we have this impacts project program which we have put about a half a million dollars in, and this is something I would judge to be along the lines of the Peace Corps. In other words, you go right into communities, you help them help themselves. We buy machines with which you can very economically make cement blocks. So we believe these machines and these people with very little quantities of cement and the materials that are available help them help themselves.

In Honduras we built low cost houses, I think we built about a hundred houses, costing \$500,000 for the banana workers, but it represents

the first possession these people ever had in their lives in the way of housing.

So this project, this impact project program, this is entirely AFL-CIO money or it was at the start. Now I understand that the ambassadors in the different countries are forwarded some money by the State Department for the same type of project.

But the Social Projects Department money is used to pay these technicians whose job it is to channel this money to the various projects. We act as the inbetween agency that lets the State Department know here is a union that wants to build a housing project for its members, here they are and we tell them who they are. From that point of this feasibility study goes into everything and it is just the same as if we were not in the picture because if the U.S. Government wants to send this money down there and help these people and decided to go into the housing field they would have to make this sort of feasibility study.

What happens when the housing is built? We finance it out of trade union funds, we hold the mortgage.

Senator CHURCH. Are those trust funds, welfare funds?

Mr. MEANY. Senator, they are welfare and pension funds and that is the reason that we secured from AID a guarantee for the principal of these funds because otherwise we could not use the funds because the funds do not belong to the union, they belong to the individual members. But these funds are down there at a low rate of interest, and at the time we put the 5½ percent \$10 million loan in Mexico City the going rate for mortgages for homes in Mexico City was then 17 percent.

MEXICO CITY HOUSING PROJECT

Senator CHURCH. Can you tell me how that Mexico City project is repaying? Are the repayments coming in on schedule?

Mr. MEANY. Payments coming in right on schedule.

Senator CHURCH. Right.

Mr. MEANY. Right on schedule. It is a sound project and it has provided homes for 20,000 people there that never had that kind of a home before.

Senator CHURCH. Now, I think that gets the facts out pretty clearly as to the financing.

Mr. MEANY. Let me go a little further. When this project was completed, a small group of people, three or four, were put down there to reside there, to see this new project did not become a slum, that the people knew how to handle it and so forth. These people are paid by the AIFLD and this is carrying out our Government's aid program and we become an agency.

But the educational part use, I would say, two-thirds of our private AIFLD funds.

Senator CHURCH. I was very much interested in your testimony a few minutes ago when you said you are not here for the purpose of pleading for Government money.

Mr. MEANY. That is right.

Senator CHURCH. You were here to get the facts out on AIFLD?

Mr. MEANY. That is right.

GOVERNMENT SUPPORT OF AFLD QUESTIONED

Senator CHURCH. Now, the question I have in my mind about the role you play in Latin America concerning the promotion of the free labor trade movement is this: It seems to me that the greatest influence that the American labor movement could have on the development of a similar movement of workers in Latin America depends on the independence of labor. You are speaking not for the Government of the United States, you are speaking for the trade union movement and your experience in having developed it, not its being developed by the Government. If it were left to the Government we would not have a trade union movement like we have in this country today.

But when it is known in Latin America that your activities are financed to this degree by the Government, don't you think that this tends to impair the influence that you might otherwise have if you were financing it entirely on your own?

Mr. MEANY. No; I do not think so. I think the people of Latin America know there is an Alliance for Progress. I think they know that the U.S. Government is committed to help down there.

Senator CHURCH. I am not talking about the social projects. I am talking about the educational work you do in the development of a labor movement.

Mr. MEANY. Well, Senator, let me say that when we went to the business people, this was the unanimous decision of our executive council, to bring business in, we did not need business in here. The amount of money that business puts in we could very well put in ourselves, it is not beyond our resources to put this money in. But we felt that the businessmen should have the same interests in Latin America as we have, that they should want to see safe, sound, free societies there, especially if they were businesses that had some business to do in Latin America.

So there is no secret in this, that we have Government money and Government assistance in this field. In fact, the amount of Government assistance we get in the educational field we could get along without that too, we could carry that, too. We felt it was a proper partnership of labor, business, and Government in this country and, of course, we were criticized by the Communists, but we cannot worry about our image with the Communist unions because whether we use Government help or not they would criticize us for something else, so we are not concerned with that. But we have no problems with the Latin American unions, none at all.

EFFECT OF DICTATORIAL GOVERNMENTS ON AFLD ACTIVITIES

Senator CHURCH. That brings me to the last question I want to put today, Mr. Chairman.

You have mentioned dictatorial governments several times in your testimony, Mr. Meany. I know the American labor movement strongly opposes dictatorships of any kind. In Latin America today the slide toward dictatorship has been very precipitous and very extensive, so that many Latin American governments are military and dictatorial at the present time.

Now, in those situations where the policy of the Government and the character of the Government is such as to impair the free trade union movement within these countries, how does this affect the AIFLD in its activities? I don't have to specify the countries; you know which they are.

Mr. MEANY. Well, all right.

May I point out to you that in my testimony I indicated that the only three countries which we had not operated in were in Haiti where you have the dictatorship, Paraguay where you have the Stroesser dictatorship and, of course, Cuba where you have the Castro dictatorship.

However, in some of these other countries while we were in operation in these other countries, while we were doing business with them, the situation changed. For instance in Peru, you now have a military government there and, of course, there are all degrees of these so-called military governments. Some of them let the trade unions operate, some of them don't. But as far as we are concerned we are certainly not going to operate in any place where a totalitarian dictatorship prevails which by its very nature controls the trade unions. This puts the trade unions out of our program completely. We cannot have anything to do with them.

But I do say we were operating in some of these countries when there was a change made and a military government came in and one in point is, of course, Peru.

Senator CHURCH. Are you saying that where, let's say, in Brazil—I do not know the specifics of the matter—I don't know whether free trade unionism at the moment in Brazil has been simply put down by the government, but in those cases where you find that to be true—

Mr. MEANY. We do not.

Senator CHURCH. Then you do not maintain or continue a program?

Mr. MEANY. No; that is true.

Senator CHURCH. I think that is all the questioning I have, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Senator from New Jersey.

Senator CASE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

PROGRESS OF FREE TRADE UNIONISM IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. Meany, I wonder if you could give us either now or later some indication not of the intentions with which you conduct your programs but of how it is actually working out, and specifically on this question of union organization.

Mr. MEANY. How is it working out?

Senator CASE. For example, what is the membership of the free unions in these countries and how has it grown or been reduced over the years?

Mr. MEANY. The unions in these countries since we started this work about 7 or 8 years ago have made tremendous progress.

Now, these countries have had unions, of course, for many years, you know, in Latin America. Some of these unions are quite old there. They suffered from the fact that they had to operate under dictatorships. There are very few of them that don't have political godfathers

sort of to take care of them, but I would say that since we started this educational program, and this program of helping in social projects, that these unions have made tremendous advances in membership and every other way.

Now, they are still a long way from having the stability of the American unions or the finances of the American unions. They are still operating in low-wage economies. I mean their wages are way down compared to ours. But by comparison of the last 8 years we think they have made a lot of progress and we think, Senator, we think we have helped them. We really do.

Senator CASE. Are there any statistical studies or reports on these questions that we might have for the record or is this an area in which it would be good to go into?

Mr. MEANY. We have some reports but—whether the State Department has more or not I do not know but—we will try to get you whatever information there is on that point.

Senator CASE. If you would, I would appreciate it. Mr. Chairman, I ask that they may be made either a part of the record or printed as such or filed with the committee for use with the report.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection.

(At the time of printing, this information had not been supplied.)

Senator CASE. I would just like to make a couple of observations. First, in my judgment, your own attitude and the attitude of those who agree with you on matters of foreign policy, have not changed. I think you are quite correct in pointing out that your attitude toward the cold war antedated any of these programs and has been consistent.

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL REVOLUTION NEEDED IN LATIN AMERICA

Second, there is a fairly substantial body of opinion which holds that, as far as Latin America goes, unless there is an effective cultural and social revolution and perhaps in some cases a political one as well, we are not going to get far. Therefore, it seems to me not undesirable that individuals be trained to raise these questions, and insofar as criticism of your efforts based upon people's going back and taking an active part contrary to a particular regime or a particular social structure or cultural situation goes, it seems to me perhaps this is desirable rather than otherwise.

I could do more harm perhaps if I went into this in greater detail but it seems to me very clear that unless something of this sort is done we are not going to get very far in Latin America, because if things just continue to go on the way they have, the rich will just get richer with the American aid and the poor will become no better off. The only way this can be done is by the government and individuals and organizations, and labor organizations certainly are among such organizations, perhaps among those best qualified to do the job. They are independent, representative of the people and, as you suggest here, capable through their own efforts of improving the conditions of the workers, and making their contributions to the economic development of their own country. That is why my main interest here is how are you doing as opposed to ideological questions on what you are doing.

Mr. MEANY. Well, I think we are making progress, and I don't think I am overoptimistic.

Latin America has got a long way to go, and I think that we have a real problem, that evidently our country has abandoned the so-called gunboat diplomacy which prevailed, you know, in the early days of this century, and I have no quarrel with that. But what happens in most of these cases, Senator, a military junta moves in and they take possession of the palace and they get on the palace radio and say "well, everything is fine, we have taken over the country for the great mass of the people," et cetera, et cetera, and, of course, some of the liberal elements, so-called liberal elements, they scurry out of the country or go into hiding. But the record has been within a few days the Government of the United States unfortunately would recognize this new regime.

So I am convinced that if we are going to have democratic societies and free societies in Latin America they have got to come from the inside, that the people themselves have got to see to it that they are free societies, and I think what we are doing in trying to develop free trade unions in itself is making a contribution toward that end because you cannot dictate in any country any place at any time unless you control the free trade unions. You cannot have trade unions really free in a dictatorship. I mean history tells us that. They are either controlled by the dictator or they don't exist.

So I think what we are doing should, in the long run, be helpful, and again I want to say that if some of the students that we send back there engage in these activities trying to get a better type of government, well, certainly that is something that we are not responsible for, but as far as I am concerned, I don't see how we could try to stop anything like that. In fact I would expect the type of fellow who learns something about free trade unions to also have an interest in the freedom of his own country.

Senator CASE. You could even go on and say, as I would say, that this does not make you unhappy.

Mr. MEANY. No; it does not.

Senator CASE. That is all, thank you.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS FOR AIFLD QUESTIONED

The CHAIRMAN. Will the Senator yield there? I still come back to this other point. If the AFL-CIO on its own, or Mr. Meany as an individual, were undertaking to do this, it is one thing. But for the Government to give to this organization the fairly sizable amounts of money to carry on these programs is simply our Government in another way using this organization for its purposes, and this, it seems to me, is the central question.

ANALOGY TO FULBRIGHT PROGRAM

Senator CASE. Mr. Chairman, isn't that a question of fact: Now, we do have, for example, the Fulbright program which I support. [Laughter.] I am trying to analyze the question, I am trying to analyze the question honestly.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean you think I direct the Fulbright program or you think I pay for it?

Senator CASE. No. No.

The CHAIRMAN. It is irrelevant.

Senator CASE. Here is a program, as I understand it, financed by the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. And directed by the Government.

Senator CASE. And selected by the Government so far as selection goes but it does not mean that the Government provides the education which is given to these kids. That is done by private educational institutions. It seems to me perhaps there is an analogy here, and the question is a factual one. Is it done in that fashion or is the Government of the United States hiring the AFL-CIO or agencies which it controls to propagandize students who are brought here?

Now, that is a different question from the question which I think has been sufficiently discussed as to whether Mr. Meany has been suborned—that is not the word—or bribed in his position on Vietnam?

Mr. MEANY. The AIFLD is a contractor with AID.

NATURE OF INSTRUCTION UNDER EDUCATION PROGRAM

Senator CASE. What kind of instruction is given to these people and how independent is it?

Mr. MEANY. Regarding that I can take a lot of time. Let me say the first instruction they get is something to acquaint them with the U.S. economy as to how our economy works. We teach communications, and the learning process—this is the advanced teacher course at Front Royal—labor educational programs in the participating countries; theory and practice automation in developed and developing nations; inflation and unemployment in Latin America; the teacher's role and class participation; population growth and education; communism and economic development; international labor movement; totalitarianism, democracy, and the role of the free trade unions; methods and techniques in adult education; planning conferences and meetings; evaluation of educational programs; planning conferences and workshop; educational workshop; union structure and finances in the union structures; and civil rights and equality of opportunity in Washington.

Then in addition to that we take these people around, let them see something of the country on their way back and forth so they can see what America looks like, and surely there is nothing subversive in our courses.

Senator CASE. I don't think anybody, even our Chairman, has suggested you were subversive. It is just a question as to whether it was Government-controlled or a fairly—

Mr. MEANY. The Government agencies know what we are doing. I would not say that they lay out the program. I really could not tell you but they do not disapprove of it I am sure.

Now, here we have got the Georgetown University class which is now in session, which will graduate in October. This is the higher educational group. This is a group of people who had a college background or equivalent in Latin America, and we felt that we could make these people what we in this country call labor economists. These are the 9 months courses. This is apart from this other series. Industrial relations, economics, statistics, collective bargaining, history and problems of the Latin American labor movement, and all of the research and technical services that we supply to our unions are made available so that they can, when they go back to their own country, serve their unions in that same capacity.

GOVERNMENT SUPPORT OF PROGRAM QUESTIONED

Senator CASE. The question really is not so much the objective of it, because I am sure we all share this objective of trying to increase democratic activities in all of these countries where we are operating. Rather, it is whether it is an effective way to do it, and whether your organization and its affiliated institutions are made less effective because you are Government supported. That is the real question.

Mr. MEANY. Could I, Senator, without reading the names, just read the different universities that supply the teachers for this course I just mentioned? Louisiana State, University of Wisconsin, Ohio State, Tulane, Howard, Loyola, Houston, Columbia, Syracuse, Duke, Vanderbilt, University of Barcelona, Catholic University, Georgetown University. This is where these people come from.

So surely I do not think we are trying to make revolutionaries out of these people but you can never tell what happens to them after they leave.

FRONT ROYAL INSTITUTE

The CHAIRMAN. If the Senator will yield on that, the Front Royal, Va. center is the principal center for training, is it not?

Mr. MEANY. Yes; that is the—

The CHAIRMAN. I want to put in the record, to keep it straight, a report of August 31, 1968, audit report No. 69-6. This is an institute that is maintained at Front Royal as an educational facility. All of these courses are on political and social structures and the students are brought here to be given this training which may be very good, but, for trade unionists to be brought to this country to be given training in political and social structures in an institution conducted by the AIFLD is a little unusual.

I would submit to the Senator from New Jersey this is in no sense similar to the Fulbright program [laughter] with foreign students. We do not take them into a Government institution and have a prescribed program for them. They are free to go to any institutions which are private institutions in this country, and there is no effort to try to direct or inculcate a particular point of view in the instruction and I do not quite see the connection.

Mr. MEANY. Mr. Chairman, we certainly are trying to direct a particular point of view that we believe in a free society.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MEANY. And that we should hope that they would get enough contact with a free society.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not criticizing you for that. I only say there is a basic difference in the two programs. They are not similar at all. I was just trying to keep the record straight that it is not the kind of program that is conducted here at Front Royal.

Mr. MEANY. Mr. Chairman, the thing I read was from the curriculum of Front Royal. That is the Front Royal program that I read off to you.

The CHAIRMAN. I will put the audit in the record.
(The audit referred to follows:)

EXCERPT FROM AUDIT OF U.S. AID MISSION TO URUGUAY OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER, SEPTEMBER 6, 1968

EXHIBIT B.—AUDIT REPORT NO. 69-6

PROJECT 528-13-410-010 LABOR LEADERSHIP TRAINING, INFORMATION ON PARTICIPANTS FINANCED UNDER AIFLD/U CONTRACTS AS OF AUG. 31, 1968

Participant's name	Training given by AIFLD/W at—	Type of training ¹	Contract No.	Period of training		Present position
				From—	To—	
Jorge Hoffman	Front Royal, Va., and Europe.	Political and social structures.	1a/162	(?)	(?)	AIFLD/Ecuador.
Angel Reyes	Front Royal, Va.	do.	1a/162	(?)	(?)	Federación Nacional Trabajadores Azucareros.
Horacio Russo	Front Royal, Va., and Europe.	do.	1a/162	Jan. 6, 1964	Mar. 24, 1964	Asoc. Empleados Correos y Telégrafos.
Juan F. Carciavello	Front Royal, Va.	do.	1a/162	Jan. 6, 1964	Mar. 24, 1964	Not active in unions.
Robustiano Costa	do.	do.	1a/162	Sept. 14, 1964	Dec. 3, 1964	Sindicato Autónomo Obreros Paylana.
Juan F. Arbello	do.	do.	1a/162	Sept. 14, 1964	Dec. 3, 1964	Sindicato Ladrilleros de Fcos. Autónomo.
José H. Brando	do.	do.	1a/162	do	do	Sindicato Obreros Regusci & Vouliniot.
Ariel Mellan	do.	do.	1a/162	do	do	Asociación Empleados Frigorífico Nacional.
Roberto Llanes	do.	do.	1a/162	do	do	Secretaría Press & Propaganda of U.S.T.I.A., Advisor to SORAU.
Juan J. Tarello	do.	do.	1a/162	do	do	Sindicato Autónomo Aluminio del Uruguay.
Oswaldo Redekosky	do.	do.	1a/216	Apr. 6, 1965	June 10, 1965	Presidente, Asoc. Empleados y Obreros Municipales—Lavaljeja.
Carlos Kelly	do.	do.	1a/216	Apr. 6, 1965	June 10, 1965	Sindicato Autónomo del Omnibus.
Daniel Paredes	do.	do.	1a/216	Jan. 11, 1965	Mar. 15, 1965	Sindicato de Artes Gráficas.
Maria Cabrera	do.	do.	1a/216	May 3, 1965	June 10, 1965	Instructor AIFLD/U.
Luis A. Martínez	do.	do.	1a/216	July 12, 1965	Sept. 16, 1965	Sindicato de Artes Gráficas.
Homero Durand	do.	do.	1a/216	July 12, 1965	Sept. 16, 1965	Sindicato Autónomo Trabajadores Indagro.
Armando Branchini	do.	do.	1a/216	Sept. 20, 1965	Dec. 7, 1965	Union Ferroviaria.
Nelson Mattio	do.	do.	1a/216	May 3, 1965	June 11, 1965	PTTI Employee in Uruguay.
Everd Porley	Front Royal, Va., and Europe.	do.	1a/216	Sept. 4, 1966	June 8, 1967	Asociación Nacional Funcionarios Públicos.
Horacio Prunell	do.	do.	1a/216	July 31, 1967	Sept. 28, 1967	Coordinator of Education AIFLD/U.
Julio Rios	Front Royal, Va.	do.	1a/216	July 31, 1967	Sept. 28, 1967	Sindicato Obreros Regusci & Vouliniot.
Enrique Orue	Washington Abreu	do.	1a/259	May 22, 1967	July 27, 1967	Federación Nacional Trabajadores Azucareros.
Oscar Brian	do.	do.	1a/259	May 22, 1967	July 27, 1967	Cooperative Advisor of AIFLD/U.
Rodrigo Lopez	do.	do.	1a/259	Jan. 11, 1965	Mar. 15, 1965	Union del Frigorífico del Correo.
Federico Carreras	do.	do.	1a/259	Mar. 7, 1968	May 15, 1968	Sind. Ind. Textil & AIFLD/U. Instructor.
Maria C. Delgado	do.	do.	1a/216	Mar. 7, 1968	May 15, 1968	Sindicato Autónomo del Omnibus.
Mario Giordano	do.	do.	1a/259	May 17, 1968	July 6, 1968	Empleados Palacio Legislativo.
Rodó Blanco	do.	do.	1a/259	July 5, 1968	Aug. 25, 1968	Organización Nac. de Motos & Anexos.
César Bergallo	do.	do.	1a/259	do	do	VEODET.
Martin Silla	do.	do.	1a/259	do	do	do
Nelson Echeverría	do.	do.	1a/259	do	do	do

¹ Political and social structures includes collective bargaining and community development.

: Not available.

METHOD OF MISSIONARY WORK QUESTIONED

Senator CASE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether there is all that difference. There is a formal difference, true. The Fulbright people go to their own institutions, I suppose they have to be approved at adequate educational institutions, but beyond that they are free to go where they want, I think. I assume the statement you make is correct. You do know, of course.

But all these institutions are educating against a general background and with a philosophy of freedom. Now, this is just as basic in the Fulbright program as it is in this program here. I wonder, therefore, if there is quite the great difference. Isn't the important question really whether this thing is working or not? I think we are entitled to try to spread the word that freedom and democracy is the best way to operate a society in a country, and I am sure nobody wants to apologize for that. We are entitled to do it as missionaries in any way that works. The question of whether the old-fashioned type of missionary work was sensible was not based upon the fact that it was wrong but that it perhaps was not the soundest way to do it and certainly it is not now.

Mr. MEANY. Isn't this the whole idea of the entire AID program?

Senator CASE. I don't know how you can deny it.

Mr. MEANY. This sum of money that you mention as being used by AIFLD is just a tiny, minute part of the entire AID program and the entire AID program is not spent by the Government but universities and foundations and so and so.

Senator CASE. Whether it is infected by a group of people who are so hard nosed and embittered by the cold war and so hard and bitter is another matter. I have not seen from the evidence I have inspected, we have not really much evidence on that point, Mr. Chairman.

UAW PART OF AIFLD ACTIVITY

The CHAIRMAN. Has the UAW ever been a part of this activity, Mr. Meany?

Mr. MEANY. Yes, sir. One of the incorporators of the AIFLD was Mr. Walter Reuther and he stayed on the board of the AIFLD and participated in its work until he had a quarrel about some other matters and then he left the AFL-CIO. He was an incorporator of this organization and his name is on the incorporating papers right from the start.

The CHAIRMAN. And he approves of this activity?

Mr. MEANY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is news to me.

Mr. MEANY. Yes; of course, he may not approve of it now that he is out of the AFL-CIO but he did approve it while he was with us.

The CHAIRMAN. When did he leave the AFL-CIO?

Mr. MEANY. In May of 1968. But he resigned as an executive board member in 1967.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of any precedent for any other activity of this character in which the money is turned over to an organization similar to yours?

Mr. MEANY. To a private institution?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. I would say the money in the case of the foreign—

Mr. MEANY. I would like to check on that. I am quite sure that there are private institutions in America that use this aid money under contracts with AID, the same as we do. I do not have the material here.

EXCHANGE PROGRAM

The CHAIRMAN. I use the exchange program as an illustration. This money is not administered by a private institution in that sense at all. It is a government operation just as the State Department is a government operation.

Mr. MEANY. This is a government contract operation, too.

The CHAIRMAN. And the AID is a government operation. I do not know of any case quite like this where the organization has the freedom you have to spend the money, the freedom that AIFLD has been given to operate in the foreign field. Certainly the direction of the cultural exchange programs is not similar to the educational activities at Front Royal.

Mr. MEANY. We play a part in the exchange program, Mr. Chairman. We play a large part in the exchange program.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean by bringing students here?

Mr. MEANY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, that is what—

Mr. MEANY. No, not at Front Royal, I am talking about the regular exchange programs all over the world through the Labor Department financed completely by Uncle Sam. We had at our convention in Miami in December of 1967, we had 175 visitors there all brought here by the U.S. Government with our cooperation.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the leadership program?

Mr. MEANY. Yes.

APPOINTMENT OF LABOR ATTACHÉS

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any control over the appointment of our labor attachés who are sent abroad?

Mr. MEANY. Control, no. We make suggestions. I would not say we control it at all. But we have recommended a number of people and they have been accepted and are serving abroad, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Mr. George Delaney?

Mr. MEANY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is he?

Mr. MEANY. He is a special assistant to the Secretary of State, and I think his job is sort of a liaison between the State Department and the Labor Department.

The CHAIRMAN. He is the Coordinator of International Labor Affairs, isn't he?

Mr. MEANY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And wasn't he formerly an official of the AFL-CIO?

Mr. MEANY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. He was not?

Mr. MEANY. No, he was not.

The CHAIRMAN. Or one of its unions.

Mr. MEANY. He was a member, I do not know if he was ever an official of any of our unions.

The CHAIRMAN. Of its affiliated unions?

Mr. MEANY. He was a representative, a worker's representative, on the ILO representing the U.S. Government. He worked in the Labor Department. He has been in Government service to my knowledge for over 20 years.

The CHAIRMAN. I was told he was a representative of one of your unions that had come out of your organization, the AFL-CIO.

Mr. MEANY. He was a member of a union.

The CHAIRMAN. He does pass on all assignments of labor attachés? I am not trying to criticize, but it is the factual situation I am trying to develop. There seems to be a very close tie, or there has been, and it may be perfectly proper but I think that it is a question for us to consider as to whether or not we do support an activity of this kind which is not really a government one. It is very difficult to know what it is doing.

Is the Senator from New Jersey through?

Senator CASE. Yes, I have been.

The CHAIRMAN. The Senator from Wyoming.

Senator McGEE. Still here, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I wish you would not sit under that light, it is so difficult to see.

Senator McGEE. That is the price I pay for being the last man on the ladder.

The CHAIRMAN. Just move around over here.

EXCHANGE BETWEEN SENATOR FULBRIGHT AND SECRETARY ROGERS

Senator McGEE. Mr. Chairman, I have thought of what I might best seek to do here, as we wind this up. We have wandered afar into many, many fields, in all kinds of directions, and I think that the focus has been put by the Chairman, on the one hand, in one context, and by Mr. Meany, on the other, in a different context, and I would like to take a look at each.

The Chairman says we are here to examine the program which is now subsidized by AID in Latin America.

Mr. Meany says he is here to try to straighten out the allegation that the program itself is some kind of a payoff for his support of the Government in Vietnam.

I was here for the original hearing and sat through the exchange the Chairman had with Secretary of State Rogers. To pin it down tightly, I would like to read into the record the relevant passage as taken from the hearing on Monday, July 14, 1969.

In that hearing Secretary Rogers and the Chairman were in a colloquy concerning a letter from Mr. Staats. The Chairman, and I quote now, refers to justifying the program in Latin America to which questions had been put here this morning and I quote the phrase exactly:

... what is the justification for pouring out over \$1 million a year to Mr. Meany to build up his unions in Latin America? What is the justification for it? Is this the price that we pay them to support us in Vietnam?

Now, that is the record of that exchange.

In response to Secretary Rogers' reply that he would have to see the letter before he could comment on it. The Chairman then in a response proceeds to say:

"I can understand why the previous administration pursued it," meaning this program in Latin America, "because they had such a stalwart supporter in Mr. Meany."

Earlier in the record there are two related references that I think leave no doubt, at least, about the sharp line that is drawn, and that is that the money that is involved in this program is over \$20 million a year—

The CHAIRMAN. Not a year.

Senator McGEE. No; excuse me, \$20 million total allocated to the AFL-CIO. I quote:

\$1 million a year, and it appears to be rather unusual to have turned over that much money to Mr. Meany. Of course, Mr. Meany has been a very strong supporter of the previous administration's foreign policy, especially in Vietnam and elsewhere, and Mr. Lovestone, reputedly his principal foreign policy adviser, has been all out in pursuance of the cold war.

Now, I read those into the record, Mr. Chairman, to make sure that we are not talking about a newspaper report of what happened or of somebody's recollection of what happened or what was intended.

Now, I think on that score, Mr. Meany's interest in asking for an appearance somewhere with somebody sometime has some very substantive reason behind it. I think the record supports that.

RELEVANCE OF PAYOFF CHARGE TO PROGRAM IN LATIN AMERICA NOT SEEN

But this would entitle me as a member of this committee to ask a followup question, and that is how can we proceed then to establish the relevance between the charge of a payoff and the pursuit and development of a program in Latin America? I think if we don't close that gap that the charge ought to be withdrawn and that is where we get to the second part of our hearing today, as I heard my colleagues spell it out, and that is, what is the program all about? Is there possibly some reason for the program, and I have yet to hear from anybody here today that somehow the configuration of this program was in direct reflex response to something that happened in Vietnam.

As I look over the testimony of Mr. Meany, and read it very carefully, the detailing of the dimensions of the program there, the listing of the nonprogram activities of the AFL-CIO, the span of time that both encompassed, if I may say so, it seems to make some kind of pretty good sense if there never had been a Vietnam, never been a Berlin, a China or Russia or anybody else, that the issue here really ought to be confined to the operation of this program in Latin America.

We have been talking here a little bit about what business a labor organization has in involving itself with the activities of laborers in other countries.

When I used to be involved in these programs, not a labor program, we were involved in getting students involved, we were involved in getting businessmen involved, businessman to businessman, banker to banker, livestockman to livestockman. I had a group from my State go to Peru to try to spend time with them spreading a little bit of know-how in breeding herds of livestock as the experience in Wyoming would have dictated.

We have towns adopting towns, we have government employees in cities matching government employees all over because we think this is an effective way outside the formalities of diplomacy, outside of the rigidities of government relationships to strengthen ties and understandings of images with other countries. It just seems to me there is so much basic substantive good sense for establishing the same rapport in labor ways, and it is not confined to Latin America, I understand, but in other areas of the world, too, that I do not see the relevance between this as a payoff to our very difficult and controversial and often incomprehensible position in Vietnam. I think our record ought to be made clear on that score.

Mr. Meany has said to us that he is not here to petition for money for this program. He is here on this other reason. But I think that we still ought to understand the program that is in contention here, and I think it ought to be divorced entirely from our assessment of Vietnam.

ALLEGED BASIS OF AIFLD GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

The CHAIRMAN. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Senator McGEE. Yes; I will be glad to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Senator believe that AIFLD would have received the kind of support it had if Mr. Meany had opposed the intervention in the Dominican Republic or had opposed the policy in Vietnam?

Senator McGEE. Let me say that I would not be in the omniscient position of judging what would have happened on something that did not happen, though some people can. I hesitate to do so. I only say that regardless of what he ever had thought anywhere else in the world that this makes good sense in Latin America. I have seen some of it in operation there and I think that ought to be our focus.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is a different question from the one I thought the Senator was making. All that my comments were intended to show was that the very strong and vigorous support, endorsement of President Johnson's policy in Vietnam, was certainly not inconsistent with continued and increasing contributions from the Federal Treasury. That is all I mean.

Senator McGEE. It has nothing to do with the merit of a program that ought to be supported in good sense and well could be supported as a matter of good sense?

The CHAIRMAN. That could be considered a separate question.

Senator McGEE. I think the innuendo of the Chairman's statement—

The CHAIRMAN. It is not an innuendo. It is a statement of fact.

Mr. MEANY. It is an inference, it is an innuendo, and it indicates to me that you feel that anyone that disagrees with you on foreign policy must have an ulterior motive, that somebody must pay them off. Who paid you when you voted to support their policy in Vietnam? Somebody pay you for that? I don't think so. But I have as much right to say that somebody paid you for voting for the Tonkin Gulf resolution as you have to say that Johnson was paying me for supporting him in Vietnam.

The CHAIRMAN. I did not say that you had—

Mr. MEANY. You supported the Government for quite a while in this area.

The CHAIRMAN. I made it quite clear at the beginning that as an individual you have a right to support that policy if you like, because many people do, as the Senator from Wyoming has all along. He has a perfect right to do so and it is quite possible that history will prove him to be correct. But that is a different matter from supplying large sums of money to you to be used with the freedom that this record shows you use it.

Mr. MEANY. Mr. Chairman, they were not supplying money to me. This money is used to carry out U.S. Government foreign policy. Now you may not agree with that policy. But the people who approve the use of this money in this way agree that it is a good thing to help develop free trade unions, that the free trade unions can play a part in developing viable democratic societies, and the development of viable democratic societies in Latin America is in the interest of the United States of America.

VALUE OF AIFLD ACTIVITIES QUESTIONED

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Meany, you can outtalk me, you can shout louder than I can, but I wish you would let me finish a sentence and then I will let you finish one.

You are assuming the very point at issue, as to whether or not your activities do promote this policy. There is a very great and growing sentiment in this Congress and I think in the country that our policy of trying to preserve the status quo in Latin America is against our interest, that our policy in Latin America has been a failure. I have already cited that, and I certainly share that view certainly beginning with the Dominican intervention that our policy in relation to Latin America has deteriorated very seriously, and your activities through AIFLD, I think, on the merits, are very questionable as to whether they are contributing to the interests of this country. This is the matter at issue. That is a different matter really from the one that the Senator from Wyoming raised. You could not cite any precedent of any other labor union or organization having any such similar treatment. This is a fact of life.

I have no doubt that it is reflected in other relationships and it is not unusual and it certainly is not disreputable. You have every right to do as you please about your policy but we also, in our responsibilities of approving this kind of expenditure of funds, have our responsibility.

PROCEDURE FOR EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS IS THE ISSUE

It is most unusual, and I can think of no precedents in which this kind of money is given to an organization to use with such freedom. I understated that when I said \$20 million, actually I was being much too modest.

Senator McGEE. \$33 million.

The CHAIRMAN. It is over \$30 million. It is very unusual to be given to an organization for disposition, as it has, as this has been

done, without the kind of direction that, say, the State Department has. In a sense it is a small State Department in Latin America, and it is a question of whether or not this is a proper procedure. That is what is at issue. That is the issue I was raising in the previous meeting, and I thought that was the issue to be raised today as to whether or not this is a legitimate and proper way to dispense public funds.

Mr. MEANY. Well, you, Mr. Chairman, you are inferring that the Government gives us this money and has nothing to do with it. This is ridiculous. Every cent of this money—

The CHAIRMAN. I read you the official reports.

Mr. MEANY. Every cent of this money is accounted for under your Government regulations, it is got to be, and if it isn't, criticize the State Department, don't criticize me for that.

The CHAIRMAN. I read you the reports and certainly that criticism—

Mr. MEANY. You read me one sentence of the report.

The CHAIRMAN. I will read the rest of it. It, as you correctly state, is not related just to you. It is the lack of supervision by AID. It is, as you properly said, a reflection upon the administration of AID itself. That is quite clear, I think, from the record. It is not saying that you personally, certainly, or even AIFLD is the organization which has the responsibility for that supervision. But nevertheless the effect is that it is administered without supervision, that is what the report says.

Mr. MEANY. That is not—

The CHAIRMAN. The fault of it being—

Mr. MEANY. Mr. Chairman, that is not true, that is not true.

The CHAIRMAN. Without its control. I read it there. I will read it again if you like.

Mr. MEANY. Mr. Chairman, we have had GAO people in that office every day practically for the last 2 years. Monday of this week they were still there.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, these are not—

Mr. MEANY. If you say that is not supervision—

The CHAIRMAN. These are not my ideas, these are in, I told you, the draft of the follow-on audit by the GAO. I read you part of it. This, of course, has not yet been made public; this is the latest one—

Mr. MEANY. Could I get a copy of that?

The CHAIRMAN. You will eventually.

Mr. MEANY. Eventually.

The CHAIRMAN. AID will have it and through AID you will get it, as you did, I believe, the previous one.

Mr. MEANY. I tried to get it the last few days and was told it was a secret document.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, until they have been finalized, all of these reports are what they call confidential, but are not intended as a classified document when completed. But these are the latest ones we have. I have the previous one which contains statements similar to this latest one, such as "also we found that AIFLD performed the functions it desires regardless of what is called for in the task orders. In Chile, for example, the task order stated that in 1969 AIFLD will give six national seminars of 6 weeks duration. However, the Chile

country labor plan does not include any 6 weeks seminars at all, and we have been informed that AIFLD has not given the 6 week seminar in Chile since 1967," and so on. It goes on, I don't want to bore you with a long reading, but there is exactly the same idea that I read you before.

You may have a very good point that AID is falling down in its responsibilities in not checking your program more closely. I thank the Senator for yielding but I think there are several distinct questions involved here.

Now the question that bothers the Senator is that when one is agreeable to a President he is treated more kindly. I can testify that that is true and I believe the Senator from Wyoming can testify to it. I know it from my own experience, and the reverse, I will say, is also true. So there is nothing unusual about that. There is no use in being so self-righteous and not recognizing the facts of political life.

PAYOFF ALLEGATION IS NOT THE ISSUE

Senator McGEE. May I say, Mr. Chairman, there is quite a difference between being invited down to the sitting room of the White House and launching a program in the national interest—

The CHAIRMAN. This is much more serious.

Senator McGEE (continuing). In Latin America, and I don't think this is something we ought to be playing games with or taking lightly. This is serious.

The CHAIRMAN. I agree with you.

Senator McGEE. If there has been a payoff we want to know about the payoff. And if there is nothing here that suggests a payoff I think it only discredits the level of the hearing because if there is a wise program is a legitimate question to be raised by the members of this committee. Whether the money is wisely spent in the right places ought to be challenged. But I think we ought to do away now once and for all with an allegation that nobody is willing to produce testimony on that says, "Look, George, if you hang by us in Vietnam we will see you get this boondoggle in Latin America." No one has suggested that and that is why I would like to keep the level of the hearing where we can get at the root problems in this program. That is the basis of the plea of the Senator from Wyoming, and I was impressed with the non-government activities of some of the labor groups in Latin America that have no relevance to what is going on elsewhere or our own Government programs down there.

But I think it is well worth keeping in mind that the accumulation of whatever hostile sentiment may be in Latin America, so far as I know, hasn't been hostile sentiment against any kind of a labor program there. I think it might have to do with some of the military programs.

How many generals have you trained in your program, Mr. Meany?

Mr. MEANY. None.

Senator McGEE. Really what it comes down to, as I see it, Mr. Chairman, are the things that I think you and I stand for to try to de-emphasize the military and to discourage, if possible, in whatever reasonable way we can, military takeovers or military dictatorships. Our goals are aided and abetted by any effort from the outside that has some

reasonable sense of direction with it and some expertise associated with it, outside the configuration of government or inside. I think we strengthen our chances to raise the level of that kind of a new endeavor of a new capability in some of these areas that haven't moved along as far in political ways as others have. And that is the reason I am really mystified at our effort to try to shoot down here or to try to discredit or to try to smear or whatever you want to call it, an endeavor that is another endeavor in this direction. I think there ought to be some Brownie points for that.

I happen to think it works well, too, but we differ on that and that is the reason I think we ought to get this whole hearing on this issue back to the test of the program and not to these allegations about payoffs.

I think all that does is cloud the air, and makes it difficult for the rest of us on the committee to assess the program itself.

NEWS RELEASES ON DOCKERY REPORT

I had a couple of questions that I wanted to pursue with you in regard to your testimony, Mr. Meany. In your text you referred to the fact that after the release of the Dockery report the item was picked up by unfriendly news media throughout the world and made to appear as an attack on AIFLD by the Senate subcommittee.

Mr. MEANY. Exactly.

Senator McGEE. Do you have anything that you could insert in our record?

Mr. MEANY. I can put in the record a release from the Moscow radio, peace and progress in English broadcast to Central America in July of 1968 and it says, I will just read the first few paragraphs:

The Senate Committee on Inter-American Affairs has published a report on the activities of the so-called American Institute for the Development of Free Trade Unions. The authors of this report point out that this institute has become the main instrument for the U.S. Government for the practical execution of its policy toward Latin American trade unions.

And the report goes, on, of course slandering, I think, the AFL-CIO.

Then, of course, we have a report July 3, 1969, from the Daily World, that is the Communist paper, the successor to the Daily Worker in New York, and the last paragraph, I will just read that:

From the experience since last summer when a Senate subcommittee, headed by Senator Wayne Morse, looked into AIFLD and what use it made of the millions the government gives it, the advice in that study that AIFLD be liquidated may find wider acceptance.

Well, there was no such advice in the release. Senator Morse did not condemn the AIFLD in any way at all, and he disclaimed responsibility for the report. This is what was known as a staff report. The report itself says that the members of the committee are not responsible for what is in it, and still it was used by people unfriendly to us to claim that it condemned the AIFLD, and when I say "unfriendly to us," I mean in this country as well as abroad.

"The Dockery study and the GAO report," according to this disclaimer "are published at this time solely as the basis for discussion and further inquiry. The points of view expressed do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the subcommittee or any member thereof."

But still this went out and was accepted as an official Government document which contained conclusions that were officially made by a competent committee of the Congress.

Now, of course, we felt this was unfair, and I wrote to Senator Morse, we analyzed the report, we showed the discrepancies that were in it, and we asked that we be allowed to appear before the subcommittee, and Senator Morse by letter agreed to have a hearing of the subcommittee and, as I say again, I am not criticizing Senator Morse. The circumstances that developed in connection with his own election, campaign for reelection, were such that he never got around to having his subcommittee meet. But he did put in the Congressional Record the letter I sent to him and also the summary of our answer to this so-called Dockery report.

Senator McGEE. Well, I wonder if we could add also for the record the followup on another reference you make in addition to the suggestion I have just requested; namely, how the press misread and reacted to it.

You refer to a number of inaccuracies in the Dockery report. Could they be submitted in the record?

Mr. MEANY. Yes.

Senator McGEE. I would like to put them alongside.

Mr. MEANY. Yes; we have already put them in.

(See page 10 for Morse correspondence and summary of Dockery report. The press release was not furnished as of the time of printing.)

INDEPENDENT AIFLD VENTURES

Senator McGEE. Now, I think, in trying to use reasonable judgment in this matter in terms of any connection between the preceding administration and what you are doing in Latin America, I have taken the time to check a number of things in your testimony that suggest that you were there on your own in very substantial ways without any relevance to government sponsorship.

I see in 1960, the \$20,000 that you, through your organization, appropriated to study the feasibility of unionism in Latin America, in the development of the free trade union development as your objective; you are spending according to your reference 20 percent of your income on international activities where you joined with business leaders, and you detailed the identity of those leaders in a joint effort to try to make this thing work. It wasn't a narrowly based, privately oriented labor crusade of some sort. That the AFL-CIO has contributed from its own coffers, you said, \$2,300,000 in other related activities privately. This is not through AIFLD. AFL-CIO and its related groups have put in \$31 million for low-cost worker housing, you say?

Mr. MEANY. That is true; \$18 million from AFL-CIO affiliates and \$13 million from Connecticut General and Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Cos.

Senator McGEE. This is not through the aegis of the AID program; this is outside of it, is that correct?

Mr. MEANY. No, no; this is the money we use to finance these housing projects which are constructed under the aegis of AIFLD and AID.

Senator McGEE. They determine the need, is that it? I want to make sure of my statement.

Mr. MEANY. Oh, yes. The money, the actual money, for the construction comes from our union.

LATIN AMERICAN STUDENT EXCHANGE

Senator McGEE. Yes. Young Latin American students that have been exchanged from time to time were under the AID program. Have you had any that were not?

Mr. MEANY. No. You see, Senator, there is this overall exchange program which has been in existence for some years in which the trade unionists come from all over the world to the United States and our trade unionists go to other countries. This is not connected with our program, AIFLD. The AIFLD program is to bring young trade unionists here from Latin America for an 8- to 12-week course in the basic elements of a trade union movement, also in the basic elements of a free society. That was the curriculum which I read a few minutes ago from the Front Royal institute.

Now, we pay these people their subsistence while they are here so they can support their families.

After they go back they act as instructors in the branch institutes in Latin America. We have branch institutes in 15 or 18 countries down there, and they, in turn, impart the knowledge that they gained here to the membership in Latin America.

Senator McGEE. That is where the number 100,000 comes in.

Mr. MEANY. Oh, yes; it is over 100,000.

We feel that this is in the interests of our own Government, and our own Government's foreign policy. It is on this basis that we feel that the development of free societies, especially in the Western Hemisphere, is in the interests of the United States of America. The Kennedy administration agreed with this.

Now, when President Kennedy announced the Alliance for Progress we already had this institution in being, and I talked to President Kennedy, and I said to him in effect, if the Alliance for Progress is going to pour aid money into Latin America through the established societies that they have there it will result in the rich getting a little richer and the gap between poor and rich becoming wider.

We felt that for the Alliance to be a success that these moneys should be used in a way that would build up the living standards of the great mass of the people, and we felt, too, that the development of free trade unions would make a contribution toward that end.

SOCIAL PROJECTS—WORKERS' BANK

President Kennedy agreed with our approach on this, and it was under his administration that the arrangements were made for us, to set up a social projects department, apart from the educational end of it, in AIFLD to carry on these social projects and the social projects I mentioned are housing, consumer cooperatives, credit unions, even the workers' bank.

Now the workers' bank was started through a loan from the AID which we promoted, we promoted this idea, and they loaned them about \$3 million, but with the stipulation that they couldn't get the \$3 million until they raised \$300,000 from their own membership.

Let me tell you that the raising of \$300,000 in Lima, Peru, from workers in that area when you consider the wages they get seemed an almost insurmountable obstacle, but they did raise the \$300,000, they did get the loan, and they now have and have had for 5 years a going corporation that has mortgage loans on any number of housing projects, and which has 11,000 worker depositors.

We think this is all to the good.

IMPORTANCE OF FREE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

We think the development of free trade unions in itself acts as a guarantee that there will be a free society, because if there isn't a free society there can't be any free trade unions, and we feel that all of these things are in the interests of our country, and we come to this conclusion, Senator, because of our experience over the past.

I think the Communists realize the importance of trade unions. I never heard of the Communists trying to get control of the great business institutions; they don't bother with the business institutions, but they do spend great efforts to get control of worker organizations. They did in Italy in 1948, tried desperately to get control of the worker organizations in Italy, and they did not succeed because the American trade unions, without any government participation, helped in seeing that that free trade union movement was preserved.

The same thing happened in France when they captured the old French trade union movement. When liberation came, a new group was set up, and the A.F. of L. at that time helped finance that group, and, this was done because of our experience.

CZECH TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

Just think of what happened in Czechoslovakia 22 years ago. The Communists didn't have control of any of the great industries of Czechoslovakia, they didn't have any control of the great banking institutions of Czechoslovakia, they didn't have any control of any votes of any substance in the Czech Parliament, but they managed to achieve control of the trade union movement. They didn't turn the members into Communists. They didn't become Communists. They are not Communists today.

Senator McGEE. You mean the trade union movement in Czechoslovakia?

Mr. MEANY. Czechoslovakia. But the Communists took control of this organization in 1947, and they tied up the city of Prague. There wasn't a loaf of bread baked, there wasn't a quart of milk delivered, there wasn't a telephone in operation, there wasn't a radio in operation, there wasn't a wheel turned. It was a dead city, and then they went to Edward Benes and those in charge of the Government and they said, "We have proved that we have the people of this country with us. We have tied up this city."

And let me tell you what happened. Within 7 days after they got a compromise out of Benes and got one Cabinet post, Minister of Internal Security, within 7 days the Czech people lost their freedom.

They didn't bother with the banks. But the banks went down the drain with the business institutions. They had done this because they

had secured control of the means of production by controlling the trade union movement, and they proved that they had control by shutting down the city of Prague. And within 7 days they had control, and the Czech people lost their freedom and they haven't got their freedom back.

And let me tell you, I knew some of the Czech trade unionists back in those days. I was active in those days, and let me say to you they were just as devoted to freedom and just as patriotic as were the citizens of any country on earth but still they lost their freedom because the Communists got control of the workers' trade union movement, and this is what we want to prevent.

We feel that we have a selfish interest in this. We want to maintain a free society here in the United States, and we have every good reason to have a stake in a free society because under a free society we have managed through a free trade union movement to bring to workers the highest standard of living that prevails in the entire world right here in the United States.

So we have a stake in this.

There are people in Government who believe that the development of free trade unions in other parts of the world is in the interests of the United States of America, and that is why, that is how we are into this particular thing. We don't get any members in Latin America. We spend our money in Latin America. We spend the money of American trade unions in Latin America. We spend over 20 percent of our national income of the AFL-CIO, we spend it outside the country, spend it in Asia, in Africa.

PROGRAM IN AFRICA

I didn't testify on it but we have a going program in Africa where we have a different situation, where we are not really at the stage where we can say we can develop a viable trade union movement. We are devoting most of our money there to vocational training, to train the workers who never had any training. They were just the source of common labor under colonial rule. Now in these countries we are developing some skills.

We have a tailoring institute project that we started in Nairobi about 8 or 9 years ago that we financed without any Government assistance whatsoever, and now we have an industry employing many workers in that city making dresses and things like that.

We have a motor drivers and mechanics school in Nigeria. We have got all sorts of activities going on there which have nothing to do with AID or the AIFLD.

FREE TRADE UNIONS IN U.S. INTERESTS

So the whole basic idea is that we believe that development of free trade unions is in the interest of the whole future security of the United States of America.

I say to you it is very interesting, very interesting that we were able to get the large corporations of America, and they are large: Rockefeller Brothers Fund, International T. & T., United Corp., David Rockefeller personally, Kennecott Copper Co., Standard Oil, Koppers,

Gillette, Shell Petroleum, Crown Zellerbach, Anaconda, Sterling Drug; even the Reader's Digest made a contribution; [laughter] Monsanto Chemical, Merck Co., Pfizer Co., Otis Elevator, all these great corporations some of whom have no relation with unions in the United States, but they agreed with us that it was in the interests of the United States of America to see free trade unions developed in Latin America and they put their money in.

PRAISE FOR WORK OF AIFLD PROGRAM

Senator McGEE. I could raise my eyebrows if you had gotten a little over a million a year, let's say, to fund a study group in the Arctic or feed penguins in the Antarctic, but the thing that we are focusing on here is in an area where you relate. Any government or administration that didn't use you there or somebody like that ought to be investigated.

It just seems to me the option that is open to you in this country is enhanced, it is sharpened, it is increased in terms of trying to arrive at some kind of improved atmosphere, and I think your record over the years entitles you to a measure of expertise and makes it understandable that someone would turn to you for this kind of help in this very important and critical part of the world and in this way.

I would assume you would be the first to welcome any study to try to tighten up or redirect, add to, whatever it takes, in order to do it better.

Mr. MEANY. That is completely correct.

Senator McGEE. Do I put that correctly?

Mr. MEANY. That is completely so.

Senator McGEE. Well, I would hope that we can keep this participation going there and, as I see it, there is no skin off your back except as a citizen of the United States. As an organization or union there is no skin off your back, but as a citizen I respect your concern for it and I share it.

Mr. MEANY. We have a large organization of practically all citizens of the United States and they have the same interest as us.

We think we are on the right track here. If the moneys are not being expended properly, we would certainly welcome any investigation that would prove that. Insofar as the accounting procedures, that is something between AID and the GAO. I am not competent, I am not an accountant, to say whether the bookkeeping methods used are proper. That is something that GAO certainly would have competence in, and I would certainly believe that the AIFLD and AID would conform to whatever standards were laid down by GAO. I have no objection to that at all.

Senator McGEE. Thank you very much.

COMPARING FULBRIGHT AND LABOR EXCHANGE STUDENTS

I would be interested, and maybe it belongs in the record here too, if we could get it for the record, and I am sure with computers someone can put it together, a list of two groups, exchange students and Fulbright scholars, who might have become activists when they went back home. I think they ought to be flunked if they don't do that. That is

what I think it really comes down to, and I believe the Senator from Arkansas believes that, too; they ought to be with us and that is one of the reasons we try to get them involved.

I think the important thing is that they profit from what they have done in terms of their personal outlook or philosophy and believe enough to try to do something about it. I think this is what our programs are aiming toward, and I think this is one of the central thrusts of AID, and I just wish we could do more of it rather than to try to cut it back the way we have been doing.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

WASHINGTON POST ARTICLE

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Mr. Meany, the hour is getting late. There are a few articles raising some of the questions upon which the questions that I have given you have been based. I want to put them in the record but I would like to read part of them to you and have you comment on them. Here is a recent one from a local newspaper, the Washington Post of April 21, 1969. It is by Mr. William Greider. Since headlines can often be misleading, as you know, I won't read the headline. The article says: "Blessed with new subsidies from the Government's foreign aid program, the AFL-CIO is putting extra muscle into its worldwide operations to create counterrevolutionary labor movements in underdeveloped countries."

That is the first paragraph. It is a rather long article.

Mr. MEANY. That is the Commie line; that is what the Communists say about us every day.

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. MEANY. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, are you suggesting that either the Washington Post or Mr. William Greider are Communists?

Mr. MEANY. No. No; I am just suggesting that they are parading the Commie line.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, if not Communists you say that they approve of Communists.

Mr. MEANY. What is that?

The CHAIRMAN. If they are not Communists then are you suggesting that they approve of communism?

Mr. MEANY. No, I do not. I am just suggesting that they are following the Communist line. The Communist line is that we interfere the minute we go outside of our own country.

Of course, the best financed labor movements in the world are those that are financed by Moscow. The Italian CGIL and the French CGT, they are financed directly by Moscow; they have no worry. They don't even collect dues from their members.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Mr. Meany, I have never considered that what Moscow does should be a model for what we do. This is the very question at issue: if they do it whether or not it is a justification for us to do it.

Mr. MEANY. I didn't say it should be a model.

APPROVAL BY HOST GOVERNMENT

The CHAIRMAN. I don't think what they do is relevant to this. I am not quite sure what you do mean by that comment with regard to this article. An article by Bernard Nossiter raises another point upon which a question was raised. I will put the whole article in the record. It says:

Normally, all aid programs undertaken must be approved by the host government. But "if in the judgment of the AALC"—

which is your African organization—

getting a written assurance would present difficulties it will be the responsibility of the AALC to proceed on verbal assurance but make it a matter of record to AID. Questioned about this, Rutherford Poats AID Deputy Administrator, said he thought the policy was still in force. He said it was "the same attitude" AID takes toward other private groups it supports and was justified because "we are financing a union to union relationship."

Another point in the Greider article says: "The AID financing, of course"—which means AID financing of the AIFLD and the other institutes—it says: "The AID financing is no secret, but the new union activities do not require formal approval from the 'host country' as most foreign aid projects do."

Mr. MEANY. I have no way of knowing but I don't believe that is true, Mr. Chairman. I don't think we can go in any country unless the host country is agreeable. I don't think AID itself could go into a country if the host country was not agreeable. If they couldn't, how could we?

The CHAIRMAN. AID does not—it is true.

Mr. MEANY. But we have no right to go into these countries. If we are not welcome in any of these countries they let us know quite quickly and I am sure we would leave. So the idea we have some special privilege to go around the world and inject our philosophy into countries where the government is opposed to us, I don't understand that at all.

(For text of articles, see p. 74.)

INTERNATIONAL TRADE SECRETARIAT

The CHAIRMAN. Again referring to this latest preliminary draft of the GAO report, which is the same one to which I referred previously, I quote from page 26:

We also found that the U.S. AIFLD contract monitor in Chile has no relationships with the ITS whereas the U.S. monitor in Brazil maintains informal personal contacts with the ITSs and is aware of their activities. The U.S. monitor in Brazil, however, does not deal formally with the ITS representatives because the ITS has not received their Brazilian licenses and are operating "illegally."

We did find that notwithstanding the "illegality" of the ITS operations in Brazil that IFPCW and RCIA had continued their operations. We have been informed, however, that due to the problems of operating in Brazil that the IFPCW left Brazil in May 1969 and the RCIA was planning to leave shortly.

I think it is clear from these reports that you do not have the formal relationship with the host government that AID does.

Mr. MEANY. Mr. Chairman, you are talking about ITS's. I don't run these ITS's, I have nothing to do with them. These are international trade secretariats. We don't run them, we have nothing to do with them. We don't have—

The CHAIRMAN. These organizations are affiliated with the AFL-CIO.

Mr. MEANY. They are not affiliated with AFL-CIO. They are not. They are an international organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the RCIA?

Mr. MEANY. You should get the Washington Post to give you a little briefing on these articles.

The CHAIRMAN. These are the GAO reports. Is the RCIA not affiliated?

Mr. MEANY. I have not seen the GAO report but if they say we run the ITS's or hold membership in the ITS's that is ridiculous.

The CHAIRMAN. How about the RCIA?

Mr. MEANY. It is the retail clerks organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not affiliated with the AFL-CIO?

Mr. MEANY. Oh, yes, it is affiliated with AFL-CIO. We don't run their business either.

AIFLD SUBCONTRACTS DISPUTED

The CHAIRMAN. We earlier read about the subcontracts. I thought these unions had subcontracts from the AIFLD. There are some subcontracts to certain unions, aren't there?

Mr. MEANY. Not in Latin America.

The CHAIRMAN. None in Latin America?

Mr. MEANY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought there were. How about the IFPCW, is that any relation to the AFL-CIO?

Mr. MEANY. That is the Petroleum International.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not related—

Mr. MEANY. It is a world organization. We don't run that organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I don't know, I thought it was affiliated with you.

Mr. MEANY. No, we are not affiliated with them.

The CHAIRMAN. I will read from a memo on the subcontracts which I received from AID. I ask you whether it is correct or not; maybe it isn't; this is June 20; the cover says:

Attached are the AIFLD subcontracts that you have requested. We have sent to New York for the AALC subcontracts since we do not appear to have copies in Washington.

This is from—

Mr. MEANY. That is AALC; that is not Latin America.

The CHAIRMAN. But this comes from AID and it says "subcontract between the American Institute for Free Labor Development and the Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, AFL-CIO. (International Brotherhood Fund)."

This is a subcontract "entered into the 1st day of June 1968 between the American Institute for Free Labor Development, a nonprofit corporation, existing under the laws of the State of Delaware (hereinafter called the 'Institute'), with its principal offices located at 1925 K Street, Washington, D.C., and the Brotherhood of Railway, Airline

and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees" and it goes on, and it gives the subcontract provisions. Among other things "The subcontractor shall perform the following services but such performance is not limited hereto (sic): Render expert advice and assistance for a free and democratic transport trade union in the Western Hemisphere in the following: organizing" et cetera, but these are subcontracts, but I don't know what they mean if they are not subcontracts with the union.

Mr. MEANY. They are contracts with AID in those particular contracts, are they not?

The CHAIRMAN. What is the American Institute for Free Labor Development?

Mr. MEANY. Mr. Chairman, I would hope you could get us a copy of that report so we could look it over and be as familiar with it as you are. I have not seen the report. I tried to get a copy of it and was told it was a secret document.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you will get it in due course, I think, from AID, through what we call channels.

I will put those articles in the record for clarification of the record. (The articles referred to follow:)

[From The Washington Post, Apr. 28, 1969]

LABOR AND GOVERNMENT COOPERATE ON FOREIGN POLICY

(By Bernard Nossiter)

Organized labor and the Government's official foreign policy instruments cohabit in a murky, twilight world. It has now been illuminated in part by the minutes of private meetings, budget proposals and other documents that have recently become available.

They disclose:

- A relationship in which the Agency for International Development agrees to hide as much as possible its financial backing for AFL-CIO ventures abroad.
- A marked degree of logrolling with Federation and Government officials consulting on how best to lobby Congress for bigger AID funds.
- AFL-CIO use of Government money to execute a cold-war policy that is sometimes more rigorous than that stated by the Government itself.

Since the end of World War II, the Federation and several American unions have openly advertised their support for what they routinely call the building of "free, democratic" trade unions abroad. They cultivate the impression that these activities are financed from their own resources and for some this is true.

However, the Latin American arm of the AFL-CIO has been drawing AID money since 1962. With the disclosure two years ago that some union projects were financed by the Central Intelligence Agency, the bond with AID has been tightened.

The wish to conceal this link is understandable. Foreign unions might balk at taking money and advice from sources that are ultimately rooted in the State Department.

The policy of a concealment is revealed in a paper dated Nov. 8, 1968, governing AID's relationship with the AFL-CIO's African arm. The six-page document is entitled "Policy and Procedure for AID-supported African-American Labor Center Programs and Projects."

The Center, known by its initials AALC, is described as a "private, non-profit organization established by the American labor movement. This image should be preserved in Africa. However, there is no objection to indicating, if queried, that financial support comes from public as well as private sources."

In fact, the document records that \$500,000 to finance AALC from May, 1966, to February, 1969, came from AID. The AFL-CIO "input" was only \$100,000 or 17 per cent.

The policy paper says that AID missions abroad should pick a man to watch over the projects. "This officer will work with the AALC technician discreetly and tactfully to retain the union-to-union image. Site visits, when required, will be arranged with the AALC technician and will be as unobtrusive as possible."

Normally, AID's overseas undertakings must be approved in writing by the host government. But "if, in the judgment of the AALC, getting a written assurance would present difficulties, it will be the responsibility of the AALC to proceed on verbal assurance but make it a matter of record to AID."

Questioned about this, Rutherford Poats, AID's deputy administrator, said he thought the policy was still in force. He said it was "the same attitude" AID takes towards other private groups it supports and was justified because "we are financing a union-to-union relationship."

Asked if he thought disclosure of AID's role would lead unions abroad to reject AFL-CIO help, he said it would if they knew the projects was totally controlled by a foreign government." Poats suggested that this was not the case, although he acknowledged that the bulk of the money came from the Government.

This seems to be the pattern with the other two AFL-CIO arms for Latin America and Asia. In the six years from 1962 through 1967, the Latin agency, the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD) received \$16 million from AID. The Institute received another \$2 million, divided between the AFL-CIO and 70 business firms. In other words, 87 per cent of the money was from the Government.

More recent figures on the finances of the Institute and the newly started Asian operation were not immediately available. Since the prominent publication of AID's role in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and The Washington Post, officials of both the AFL-CIO and AID have been reluctant to discuss their affair.

A list of detailed questions was submitted to the Federation for comment. None was answered. Instead, an AFL-CIO spokesman supplied the following statement:

"The AFL-CIO is proud of the work of the American Institute for Free Labor Development, the African-American Labor Center and the Asian-American Free Labor Institute.

"We have made full, regular and complete public reports of these activities. The books of these organizations have been regularly audited and AID has reported to the Congress all expenditures.

"We have nothing to add except to note that AFL-CIO activities have always been and always will be based upon our unalterable devotion to freedom for all men in all places at all times."

However, various budget documents that have come to light, notably a letter from Ernest Lee, the assistant director of AFL-CIO's Department of International Affairs, to Poats, indicate that the relationship resembles that used by CIA. Instead of dummy foundations to pass on CIA money to bonafide organizations, AID channels its funds to the three AFL-CIO regional arms. They, in turn, pass it on to well-established unions like the Retail Clerks, Communications Workers and the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.

Some hint of AFL-CIO's support for AID and State Department positions turns up in the minutes of a body called the Labor Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance. The group, with Meany in the chair, meets about every two months and includes high officials from AID, State, the Labor Department and the AFL-CIO.

One of the most vocal participants appears to be Jay Lovestone, director of AFL-CIO's foreign affairs department.

At the meeting on Jan. 8, 1968, William Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East, "thanked Mr. Meany for the strong resolution of support for U.S. policy in Vietnam adopted at the AFL-CIO convention and mentioned that a somewhat similar resolution was passed by BATU, the Asian affiliate of the ICFTU (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions).

"Mr. Lovestone asked what labor could do to reverse the downward trend in AID's appropriations and bring greater pressure to bear on the Congress in 1968. Mr. Gaud (William Gaud, then AID Administrator) replied that there was no easy formula for solving this problem. However, a nationwide campaign to enlist greater public understanding and acceptance of foreign aid could have the desired effect on the Congress."

At the meeting of July 17, Gaud described AID's budget troubles on Capitol Hill. "He requested the AFL-CIO's intensive support and assistance in the coming legislative battle."

James R. Fowler, AID's deputy coordinator for the Alliance for Progress "reiterated Mr. Gaud's request."

On Nov. 12, Gaud thanked the union officials for their "assistance in AID legislative battles."

There is, of course, nothing remarkable in recipients of Government funds working over Congress on behalf of the agency that provides them. But the reciprocal relationship is rarely made so nakedly plain.

It is not always clear whether the AFL-CIO expenditures abroad reflect its own conception of foreign policy or that of the agency providing it with funds. A report last May by the General Accounting Office records a complaint by an unnamed AID official. He had said that the AFL-CIO's Latin American arm displays a "tendency to disregard Embassy-U.S. AID positions on important labor issues when drawing up (its) programs."

On Vietnam, at least, there were no problems. The minutes of the March 11 meeting observe that "As a result of a request from Secretary Rusk, the AFL-CIO executive council . . . voted to contribute \$35,000 . . . to the Vietnamese Confederation of Labor (CVT). In addition, AFL-CIO affiliates are being asked to give financial assistance to the CVT in its current relief efforts."

At a later meeting, AID officials explained the central role that the Vietnamese federation is to play in winning minds and hearts, noting that it has become the largest organization distributing the fertilizer that is vitally needed for growing the new, high yielding rice strains.

By November 12, an AID man was boasting to the labor leaders that the CVT was now so close to the Saigon government that "the strike of a CVT affiliate against an American firm (Pacific Architect and Engineers) should be settled in a few days."

American unions publicly pride themselves on their independence from Government and their undiluted representation of workers' interests.

AFL-CIO involvement in Saigon politics had become deep enough for Lovestone to assert at the meeting of July 17 that he had been advising Dr. Phan Quang Dan. Dr. Dan served briefly in the Saigon cabinet last year but was dropped for urging negotiations with the National Liberation Front. Lovestone related that he had urged Dan to cut short his American visit and "clarify his remarks" about the NLF in a telegram to the South Vietnam Premier, Tran Van Huong. The "clarifying" telegram is annexed to the minutes of the meeting.

In other regions, there are suggestions of differences between labor and its Government financiers.

On July 17, Lovestone complained that the Indian government had insisted that representatives from the All India Trade Union Congress, the Communist federation, be included in any delegation of Indian unionists brought to the United States. Lovestone said that AFL-CIO wouldn't have them.

On Nov. 12, Irving Brown, a long-time Lovestone associate and now chief of AFL-CIO's African agency, reported that the AID-supported drivers training school in Nigeria had arranged to train drivers for the Nigerian army. There is no explanation of how this project squares with Washington's professed refusal to help the armed forces of either Nigeria or Biafra.

How carefully the Government's money has been spent was a subject of concern in the GAO report on the Latin operations. It spoke of "serious financial management weaknesses in the AID-AIFLD contract relationship." Among other things, the GAO discovered that AIFLD, the AFL-CIO Latin agent, does not identify costs in each contract and simply bills AID "on the basis of unsupported estimates."

A note appended to the end of the GAO study says that AID later reported it had reached an agreement with AIFLD on "corrective action" over the accounts.

The taxpayers, of course, have an interest in assuring that the AFL-CIO is spending Government money in a meticulous fashion. But this curious and intricate relationship has another ramification.

George Meany for years has condemned unions in Communist countries as instruments of government. To some extent at least, American unions have acquired the same image through their relationships with the foreign policy bureaucracies of Washington.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 21, 1969]

UNIONS TURN TO AID AFTER CIA PULLOUT

(By William Greider, Washington Post Staff Writer)

Blessed with new subsidies from the Government's foreign-aid program, the AFL-CIO is putting extra muscle into its worldwide operations to create counter-revolutionary labor movements in underdeveloped countries.

The money—about \$1,120,000 a year from the Agency for International Development—buys training seminars and field organizers, often hired locally, in Latin America, Africa and Asia. Their stated goal is "developing and strengthening free trade unions throughout the world."

In practice, this ranges from prosaic matters like pension-fund squabbles to ambitious schemes for overpowering the dominant leftist labor organizations in some countries.

This "union to union" diplomacy, "uninhibited by a formal Government relationship," as one AID official explained, is just the sort of thing which the Central Intelligence Agency used to pay for secretly—before the CIA's cover was blown two years ago and it had to abandon its network of dummy foundations.

Indeed, two of the U.S. Labor organizations which now share in the AID grants arranged last June were identified as beneficiaries of the CIA's covert funding. Though their leaders denied the connection, the Retail Clerks International was linked to the Granary Fund of Boston and the International Federation of Petroleum and Chemical Workers received funds from the Andrew Hamilton Fund, both of which were CIA conduits.

After the sensational disclosures of how the CIA had penetrated domestic institutions, the Government declared that the secret financing would be stopped and in a few cases replaced by public subsidy. One CIA orphan picked up by AID was the Asia Foundation.

CALLED SHEER NONSENSE

According to the AFL-CIO's Assistant Director of International Affairs, Ernest S. Lee, it is "just sheer nonsense" to put the overseas labor activities in the same category.

American unions, he pointed out, have been carrying out international programs for years, both with AID grants and with their own money. "We have to give any support we can to free trade unions," said Lee, "so that they will not be jeopardized from any position—government, the Communists, business."

However, AID Deputy Administrator Rutherford M. Poats was more equivocal on the question of CIA financing. "I know they were not CIA-financed at the time we picked them up," Poats said. "Whether they were at some time in the past I don't know."

Poats said he was told that the unions and their international affiliates had been paying for the network of organizers—with occasional support from foundations—but that they could no longer afford to maintain them. "I don't know," Poats said, "whether, among the foundations they turned to for help in the past, any of those were CIA conduits. I just don't know."

When AID agreed to pick up the costs formerly borne by the unions, the package was arranged by AFL-CIO's Lee, who is assistant to Jay Lovestone, the Federation's international director, and is son-in-law to George Meany, the president. The AID money goes to three regional labor institutes which the AFL-CIO operates in Africa, Latin America and Asia, then is passed on by subcontracts to seven labor organizations, which are either U.S. unions or their international trade affiliates.

The arrangement was approved by the Labor Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance, a labor-government group whose regular meetings are spiced with the spirit of international combat. Presided over by Meany, the committee oversees the Federation's housing, training and institutional programs in foreign countries, which receive about \$8 million a year from AID.

The main differences in the new AID spending, Lee said, is that Government financing now supports individual trade unions working with their counterparts within countries while the focus in the past has been on broader national labor confederations. The AID financing is no secret, but the new union activities do not require formal approval from the "host country" as most foreign-aid projects do.

Jay Lovestone, the elder eminence of American labor's cold-war operations, told the AID officials "that U.S. embassy sponsorship or close identification with these programs would be untendable and counter-productive."

SUBSIDY IN NIGERIA

In Nigeria, the U.S. funds provide a modest direct subsidy to an infant union of oil workers whose dues will not support the union's activities "for quite some time to come."

In Colombia and Peru, the Retail Clerks International is concentrating on strengthening bank workers' unions. The budget proposal for Colombia listed the secretary general of the bank workers' union as the locally-hired representative.

In Japan, the long-range objective is welding together all of the diverse unions representing oil and chemical workers into one national union, to be affiliated with the Denver-based International Federation of Petroleum and Chemical Workers (IFPCW).

While most of the U.S. organizations submitted brief bland descriptions last year of how they would spend the AID money, the IFPCW's budget proposal detailed its struggle with the other side in 19 countries—how it sometimes battles dominant unions or even the Government itself.

Its affiliate in Trinidad, the IFPCW noted, had "come under the influence of the Communist leadership, if not under the direction of Communist leaders." It proposed to correct this by supporting a challenge by oil workers dedicated to the free trade union movement.

In Colombia, the IFPCW intended to challenge "Fedepetrol," a rival federation. "Fedepetrol," it said, "is controlled by Communists and its leaders have recently increased their activities in attempting to organize chemical and pharmaceutical workers."

The AID-financed program would "assist the free, democratic trade unions currently in Fedepetrol to recapture their organization from its present Communist leadership control. We must continue to work with key persons employed by Ecopetrol, Colpet and Intercol (the three oil companies where the rival union has its membership strength)."

At the same time, the U.S.-based labor group intended to beef up its own affiliate in Colombia "and assist it in developing a closer relationship with the government of Colombia. Eventually, merge Fedepetrol into our affiliate."

In Peru, the objective is signing up unorganized workers in chemical and pharmaceutical plants. However, the IFPCW said, "a rival union exists which is oriented toward the Communist Party. Our program envisions a vigorous attempt to win these employees to the democratic trade union forces."

In Pakistan, the oil federation complained, "politically, the government is leaning toward the Communist orbit and constantly puts pressure upon our affiliate and the Pakistan National Federation of Trade Unions to entertain visitors from China and the WFTU (the Communist-sponsored international organization of unions). These organizations have been able to maintain their independence in spite of government pressure."

The ICFTU and others have discovered that the helping hand of American labor is not universally welcomed.

In South Vietnam, where the AFL-CIO is pouring support into a tenant farmers' union, Lovestone complained to the State Department last year that the local labor leaders were continually harassed, even arrested, by South Vietnamese military leaders, whom the U.S. supports. "This is a source of embarrassment to the AFL-CIO which is steadfastly supporting the U.S. war effort in Vietnam," Lovestone reminded the government.

When three AFL-CIO vice presidents landed in Nigeria on an inspection tour last spring, the airport officials at Lagos submitted them to a meticulous personal search, an embarrassment which the labor leaders blamed on Communist rivals.

In Brazil, a government decree ordered foreign labor organizers to apply for permission to operate in the country, but a year has passed and none of the applications have yet been approved.

"It will be necessary that we work within the framework of the present Brazilian labor legislation," the IFPCW conceded, "but we must also work for new labor legislation and the elimination of the repressive type."

ACTIVITIES DEFENDED

AID officials defend these activities as a normal aspect of the foreign-aid program. The development of economic growth and stability requires free and strong labor unions just as it requires new industry and commerce, they contend.

"Our general view is that technical assistance to labor unions is and should be a continuing part of development," Poats said.

An AID labor adviser who covers Latin America explained: "Unions act as dividers of profits. The U.S. Government likes to see more purchasing power in the hands of these people rather than in Swiss banks."

Poats dismissed the domestic political overtones of the activities as an inevitable element. "The whole orientation is that they're out fighting the WFTU (the Communist federation) around the world," Poats said. "We are operating in host countries where the government favors a moderate, nationalist union as opposed to a Communist union."

Another AID executive put it this way: "Now, nothing is more political than labor union training. But we treat it as developmental."

The AFL-CIO devotion to international operation stems primarily from Meany and Lovestone's commitment to help America fight the Cold War, an attitude which has drawn frequent attacks from Walter Reuther and the United Auto Workers, among others. The critics suggest that the labor federation's role in U.S. diplomacy inevitably affects its attitudes in U.S. politics such as the AFL-CIO's hawkish defense of the American role in Vietnam.

In any case, there is an acknowledged self-interest for the U.S. labor organizations that work overseas. Though they do not expect to benefit directly and immediately, they are in the business of gathering new members and affiliates into the fold. One AID official described "organizing aims" and the Government aims as compatible. "If we get what we want as a byproduct of what the union wants, then it's worthwhile," he said.

And Lee offered this explanation of how the AFL-CIO views global unionism: "It's a selfish thing, too. After all, free trade unionism is our bread and butter. You get unions taken over by the Coms or even by the right-wing Fascists, what happens? It becomes stagnant, a cheap labor market. That becomes a threat to us and the United States. Industry is concerned about it, too."

AFRICAN PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Mr. Stanley Meisler? Is he a Communist?

Mr. MEANY. I don't know him.

The CHAIRMAN. He works for the Los Angeles Times.

Mr. MEANY. I don't know him.

The CHAIRMAN. He writes under the byline, "Stanley Meisler, Los Angeles Times." This unfortunately, I guess, also appears in the Washington Post, but he comes from the Los Angeles Times and discusses some of the relationships which we have just mentioned. I think this is some justification for the questions which have been raised. I will read you a little. This is about the African activities. It is dated Nairobi. It says:

American labor leaders, using U.S. Government money are trying to expand their influence in Africa, building up unions, training skilled workers, supporting favored politicians and fighting communism.

At times American labor acts as if it were a junior Agency for International Development (AID) dispensing funds and hiring technicians to help Africa develop its economy. At other times there is strong evidence that American labor, in league with some friendly European labor movements, acts as if it were a junior Central Intelligence Agency shoring up institutions and politicians to withstand the battering of communists and other leftists. In a sense, American labor in these operations sometimes acts as an arm of the U.S. Government—though it can be an uncontrollable arm.

In January, for example, Vice President Humphrey visited Kenya with an official party that included Irving Brown, executive director of the African-American Labor Center, the main agency for the AFL-CIO's activities in Africa.

Glen B. Ferguson, U.S. Ambassador to Kenya, thought it unwise to include Brown in the party. Many Kenya leaders dislike Brown because they believe he is a supporter of Tom Mboya, Minister for Economic Planning, whose union received funds from American unions when he was a Kenya labor leader before independence.

With President Jomo Kenyatta nearing 80, Kenya politicians are maneuvering for positions of power, and they bristle at the suspicion that outsiders may be coming in to help a competitor.

Ferguson cabled Washington asking that Brown be dropped from the trip. But the AFL-CIO talked to Humphrey and the Vice President turned down the Ambassador's request. Brown came to Kenya.

To your knowledge is that an accurate or inaccurate account?

Mr. MEANY. It is accurate that Brown accompanied Mr. Humphrey on that trip at Mr. Humphrey's invitation. The idea that Brown was interfering in internal politics in Kenya is absolutely ridiculous. Brown operates out of New York.

Now, I knew Tom Mboya when Tom Mboya was a trade unionist. The American Federation of Labor helped build the union headquarters in Nairobi about 14 or 15 years ago; we gave him the money to build his headquarters because Kenya was then under British rule and he couldn't hire a place for an office. The British colonial powers there wouldn't let him buy a piece of property, wouldn't let him do it. So he had to get property outside, and we helped to finance the construction of that building, and I think he was the best influence that is possible in Africa.

Yes; he was a friend of mine and a friend of Irving Brown's but this conclusion, this is a conclusion of a writer who is writing something that he wants to get printed, and there is no justification for saying just because Brown knew Tom Mboya that he was interfering in Kenya politics. Tom Mboya was a former trade unionist, he was the head of the Kenya Federation of Labor, and afterwards became Minister of Justice and I think he was murdered here, assassinated here, a few weeks ago and I think he held some other cabinet post.

But to say that because we were operating in Kenya that we were interfering in politics is just ridiculous. Sure, we knew Tom Mboya but that doesn't mean we were playing politics with him, and I don't know anything about Kenya politics and I doubt that Irving Brown knows too much about it; but as far as Brown accompanying Vice President Humphrey, Vice President Humphrey was Vice President of the United States, and he invited Brown to go with him, and whether the Ambassador objected or not I don't know, but I know that Mr. Humphrey took him with him, and I don't know what that proves as far as this fellow's story is concerned.

I have ridden on trips with the President of the United States, and at his invitation on several occasions, and I don't know what that would prove. That it would prove political influence in the country visited, that is just complete nonsense.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I don't know, Mr. Meany.

ACCURACY OF NEWSPAPER REPORTS QUESTIONED

Mr. MEANY. Well, you read a newspaper article, Senator, and you just place great reliance upon it. These people write, they either write or perish, and they will write things that are interesting. I am sure that you have been around long enough to know there is a lot of rot that comes into the public press, and a lot of material in there that has no basis or foundation in fact but that is what we pay, this is the price we pay for maintaining a free press which I am all for. But I certainly don't accept newspapers articles someone desires to write.

Now this man, if you give me his name—I never heard of him before—when did he become an expert on labor affairs?

The CHAIRMAN. I don't know him personally either but the Los Angeles Times is one of our most distinguished papers, as I regard the Washington Post; they do the best job they can. You have such a low opinion of it—

Mr. MEANY. But this doesn't make everything they print authentic, Mr. Chairman, just because they are distinguished papers.

The CHAIRMAN. No; it doesn't.

Mr. MEANY. Drew Pearson writes for the Washington Post; do you buy everything that he says? I don't. That doesn't say he doesn't get some stuff with some truth in it but surely I don't buy as gospel everything he puts in that column of his.

The CHAIRMAN. I wasn't suggesting that, but we have generally considered newspapers as being a source of information regardless of whether you agree with it. This is written from Nairobi, I wasn't myself personally there. I see no alternative hardly under our present situation but to have some regard for reporters and their stories in our more reputable papers. I know of no motive either on the part of the Washington Post or Los Angeles Times to distort the news. I didn't say that I believe every word I read, but on the whole this is the source of most of our information, whether it be in a newspaper or a book or an official report. These draft reports from the GAO I don't suppose are inviolate and utterly infallible but they are the best we have and we have to rely on them insofar as we can. If you have reason to discredit them, why, of course, that is your privilege to do so.

I assure you I am not trying to manufacture these reports. These are reports from people whose newspapers are certainly as good as we have.

Mr. MEANY. It surely wouldn't be accepted as evidence to any degree in a court of law.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Mr. Meany, we are not trying it in a court of law.

Mr. MEANY. I imagine you are trying the AIFLD here.

The CHAIRMAN. No. We are inquiring into whether or not—

Mr. MEANY. I don't claim you are impartial but I think you are putting us on trial.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Meany, I hope you don't treat all of your associates with the rudeness you treat me. You seem to be—

Mr. MEANY. Mr. Chairman, I don't. I take pride in the fact that I am not rude to anyone.

The CHAIRMAN. You are most rude to me.

Mr. MEANY. I think I came here because of the very rude remarks that you made about me. That is what brought me here.

The CHAIRMAN. I think maybe the form in which they were expressed was overstating the case. I don't think the substance was, because—

SUPPORT BY WITNESS OF VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. MEANY. You don't think—you still think then I was paid off by the Johnson administration?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that language perhaps overstates it. I didn't put it quite that way. But it amounts to that. But what I meant is

[laughter] and I will repeat it, is in the political life of this country, and I have been here 25 years, not quite as long as you have, but quite a while, we all know that there is nothing disreputable about the fact that when one is friendly with the President of the United States it is usually very helpful. It is a matter to be taken into consideration in making a judgment as to whether a program is based upon its own merits or whether—I would say every aspect of these matters should be considered, that is one of them. I think the very generous treatment of these programs was certainly influenced favorably by the fact that you were such an ardent supporter, you went out of your way to condemn me, I know, and other members of this committee in your speeches and in your conventions.

Mr. MEANY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't deny it?

Mr. MEANY. No; I disagree with you, Senator, on a lot of things.

The CHAIRMAN. It is your privilege to do it.

Mr. MEANY. And if it is done publicly it is my privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. It is my privilege to disagree with you and to point out a fact, which is well known and I think not just dependent upon an irresponsible reporter, that you were one of the more ardent supporters of the previous administration's foreign policy and that I regard it as a disastrous and tragic foreign policy is my business. I have said so publicly. The fact that you approve of it is your business, too.

All of this is beside the fact of whether or not this policy that we have been pursuing is wise.

Now, you say, you admit to facts in this report.

Mr. MEANY. What report?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Meisler's.

Mr. MEANY. What facts about what report? I haven't seen the report.

INTERVENTION BY THIS COUNTRY CRITICIZED

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Meisler's report about Brown going there. I don't wish to draw this conclusion at all, and I would not draw it. However, I think the meddling by this country, the largest and richest and most powerful country that has the greatest power of destruction the world has even seen, may be very unwise policy. I have said this on numerous other occasions. I am not at all sure that it isn't counter-productive for us to be intervening either directly, as in the Dominican Republic, or indirectly and in an informal manner, as you do through these organizations, the three of them. I am not sure this is in our interests.

What I am charged with is trying to develop wise policies. I think that you can go too far in intervening and that you drive people into the camp of the enemy. I happen to think that our intervention in the Dominican Republic may have had exactly that effect. You can take another view. You think, I assume, it was in our interests, but I hoped you would at least take the view that this is also a matter on which there can be a difference of opinion as to whether or not the United States, throwing its weight around and intervening either directly with arms or indirectly with money or with men, cannot be very offensive to these local people.

I happen to think it may be very offensive and that instead of being effective in countering communism, if you like, that it even promotes communism. Surely you would admit it is a possible point of view, and I know there are a few who share it. This is what this is all about.

I don't claim an infallibility at all. You say I am so sure of it, but we have to take a position. We even have to take one as to whether a newspaper is reputable or not. I have taken a position on this program.

I have supported the aid program in the past, but I don't know whether aid dispensed directly by a great country like this to a small country really results in better relations or not. I have come to the conclusion through a long number of years of supporting the other view that, due to various changes and attitudes, that it might be much more effective if we did it through multilateral organizations. I have said so and I have done all I can to promote our aid being administered through such an organization as the World Bank or the Inter-American Development Bank or the United Nations Development Program because of this very point.

LABOR EFFORTS AT COUNTERING COMMUNISM QUESTIONED

I am not at all sure your being so active in these various countries actually does deter communism. It could well be that you create conditions that are favorable to communism.

I, of course, don't allege nor even think that your friendship or Mr. Brown's friendship with Tom Mboya had anything to do with his assassination. From what I know of Mr. Mboya and from what I read in the paper I would think it was a great loss to both Kenya and to everybody to have a man of his quality assassinated.

Now, if we did contribute it was a misguided action. I don't think we did. I have no knowledge whatever of that.

Mr. MEANY. No. I don't think we did either.

The CHAIRMAN. I only point out that your apparent assumption that because we go in and we do these things which on the surface look as if they are against communism, that they may not always be. And the final thing with regard to Latin America that is very questionable is the fact that our relations are so bad. This was a great shock to me, the treatment that Governor Rockefeller received in so many countries in Latin America. I am not saying it is your fault. I think, though, that the overall American policy which was easy intervention by either arms or excessive personnel and military aid, especially in Latin America, has not been good. This committee has for many years, 4 or 5 years, tried its best to eliminate, to cut down and to eliminate the arms program in Latin America.

Senator Morse, when he was chairman of that subcommittee, if you will recall, constantly harped on this subject.

Mr. MEANY. We don't disagree with you on that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, as I say there are many different aspects to it, but I think it is very hard for you on general principles to say we have accomplished our purposes in Latin America.

Mr. MEANY. I didn't say that. I said I think our program has accomplished something because I think that these people are developing better unions.

Now, actually the type of aid that we engage in is a type which tries to teach people to help themselves. We don't give them any direct money to pay their salaries other than internships. But we try to give them some knowledge that would enable them to develop a trade union instrumentality that could be helpful to them.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, it all depends on how you do it, and I am not saying positively here that what you have done is against our interests, but it certainly is worthy of very serious consideration that these activities may not have aroused opposition because people are often very sensitive to intrusion from abroad in their domestic affairs.

We even find that here in this country. You are familiar with that phenomenon in this country where states often object to intrusion of the Federal Government, so it is not to be wondered at that foreign countries are sensitive to our intrusion into their affairs. These people may think that they can do as well without our invention, especially in their social and political affairs.

Mr. MEANY. Well, Mr. Chairman, we don't feel that we are intruding in any of these countries.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't but I say they may feel it.

Mr. MEANY. If they feel we are intruding we get out quite quickly.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, of course—

Mr. MEANY. We certainly are not going to try to fasten onto a society our philosophy.

FURTHER ARTICLES ON LABOR ACTIVITIES

The CHAIRMAN. I have a number of other articles I will put in the record. They all bear upon this question of your activities, either in Latin America or in Africa. They are articles that are written by men whom I cannot vouch for, but who are writing for, generally speaking, reputable publications. I submit them for the record simply as background material and for the information of the Senate and the public.

I also have a table here, Mr. Reporter, summarizing the AID financial support for AIFLD. This is from the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of March 6, 1969, and it states all of the amounts.

(The table and articles referred to follow:)

AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR FREE LABOR DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL STATEMENT, 1962-69

Years	Schedule of income				Schedule of expenditures
	Labor	Corporations	AID	Total	
1962.....	\$110,050	\$133,500	\$396,787	\$640,337	\$421,255
1963.....	139,200	158,768	954,273	1,252,242	1,375,283
1964.....	211,000	164,769	2,147,925	2,523,694	2,535,430
1965.....	200,500	164,121	3,471,597	3,836,218	3,724,186
1966.....	200,000	141,507	3,969,482	4,310,989	4,895,978
1967.....	200,000	136,351	5,292,766	5,629,117	5,364,494
1968.....	200,000	137,621	5,252,569	5,586,190	5,641,891
1969 (estimated).....	200,000	140,000	5,800,000	6,140,000	6,140,000
Total.....	1,460,750	1,172,637	28,117,767	30,751,155	30,098,517

¹ Final digits do not add due to rounding off.

Note: All amounts of years 1962-68 were taken from annual financial statements prepared by AIFLD auditors, Touche, Ross, Bailey & Smart.

Source: House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, May 6, 1969.

[From The Nation, Jan. 13, 1969]

LABOR AND STATE: MARRIAGE OF CONVENIENCE—WHAT'S GOOD FOR LATIN AMERICA

(By Henry W. Berger)

A report issued by the Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee on Latin American Affairs provides up-to-date information on the continuing adventures of the AFL-CIO overseas. Part of a larger review of the Alliance for Progress, the study is a research-staff working paper that examines the assumptions and efforts of American labor diplomacy in Latin America, the most extensive arena of AFL-CIO operations.

The report describes the alliance between the United States Government and the unions in seeking common aims of foreign policy. This involves not only a diplomatic liaison between government and trade union officials but also a formal political and monetary relationship between the government's Agency for International Development (AID) and the AFL-CIO-sponsored American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), a mutual admiration body composed of leading representatives of the unions and of the American business community. Founded in 1961 as the latest of a series of organizations concerned with labor affairs in Latin America, the AIFLD was in large part a response to Fidel Castro's revolutionary success in Cuba and the possibility that such revolutions might erupt elsewhere in the hemisphere. The AIFLD has been an instrument to combat any such developments through a program of educational, social and political assistance to favored labor elements. The Senate report charges that such aid has often amounted to actual interference in the internal affairs of Latin American unions and governments, that the AIFLD has used the funds and prestige of the United States Government to advance its objectives without government supervision, and that the AFL-CIO, which administers AIFLD, has pursued many of its aims on ideological terms which run counter to dominant social trends in Latin America.

The AIFLD receives the greatest part of its funds (\$4,875,000 in 1967) from public funds. Specifically, according to the report, this money has constituted 92 per cent of AIFLD's budget since 1966, most of its channeled through AID. The remainder of the capital comes from the unions and participating business corporations.

The broad stated purposes of AIFLD are to promote democracy and capitalism. This conjunction is important, for it is evidence that American labor organizations, like their business counterparts, see capitalism as vital to an ideal democracy at home and abroad. J. Peter Grace (of W. R. Grace and Co. and chairman of the board of AIFLD) described these aims in an article quoted by the Senate Study:

Through the AIFLD business labor and government have come together to work toward a common goal in Latin America, namely supporting the democratic form of government, the capitalistic system and general well-being of the individual. It is an outstanding example of a national consensus effectively at work for the national interest of the United States and for the best interests of the people of Latin America.

This view is shared by AIFLD President. George Meany, the chieftain of the AFL-CIO. Speaking before the Council on Latin America on April 2, 1965, Meany declared that labor "believes in the capitalist system, and we are members of the capitalist society. We are dedicated to the preservation of this system, which rewards the workers, which is one in which management also has such a great stake." And, he added, "the investors of risk capital also must be rewarded." To his Latin American listeners, Meany's words were unmistakable: American capital investment in Latin America is beneficial to both workers and management, and the investors are entitled to a fair return on their investment. The AFL-CIO leader linked this to the effective operation of a democratic society, to which Latin Americans ought to aspire. Trade unions which support this particular version of society in Latin America are preferred over others and have benefited from AFL-CIO assistance.

The AIFLD training of Latin American union officials, at the expense of the American public, is a part of the endeavor. After a period of intensive preparation in the United States, some of these graduates are returned to their countries under an internship program, also financed by the AIFLD, to spread the gospel of American trade unionism and anti-communism to their co-workers. "We feel strongly," wrote one American union official to a Latin American employer in 1962, "that through the education of the workers, it will be possible to halt the wave of communism sweeping through Latin America." As demon-

strated in the Senate committee report, these union organizers have also helped to provoke revolutions in their own countries against regimes judged unfriendly by the American labor federation and also by the United States Government.

Brazil is offered as an example where the AFL-CIO encouraged and supported efforts by AIFLD-trained unionists to overthrow the leftist government of Joao Goulart. Ironically, the Goulart regime was replaced by a military dictatorship which suppressed the labor unions—a development which presumably the American labor unions did not welcome.

Nor was this the first time that the AFL-CIO had supported an anti-Left revolution which led to a triumph of the Right. Similar results, for example, occurred in Guatemala where the leftist government of Jacobo Arbenz was overthrown in 1954 with the covert assistance of the United States in the form of money and arms, including planes piloted by U.S. citizens. There is no evidence that the AFL or the CIO (at that time still separate federations) had a hand in those specific operations, but the officers of the two organizations had long opposed Arbenz, applauded his collapse, and sent personnel to reorganize the Guatemalan trade union movement within ten days after the successor to Arbenz, Col. Castillo Armas, assumed the Presidency. Unfortunately, Guatemala has since been victimized by a succession of governments which have been variously incompetent, authoritarian and corrupt. Labor unions have suffered the consequences. Dissent against the present American-supported government has erupted into political violence claiming the lives of an American ambassador and other U.S. diplomatic officers; the regime is now confronted by a guerrilla movement against its rule.

None of this is really news. Indeed, neither is the continuity of official U.S. support for AFL-CIO foreign policy. It too is detailed in the Senate study. The government's decision in 1962 to make an initial \$350,000 available to the AIFLD included \$100,000 supplied from the President's contingency fund. This is remarkably similar to the \$50,000 which Woodrow Wilson's administration provided the AFL in 1918 from the President's special fund to finance the creation of the Pan American Federation of Labor—an instrument designed to a large degree by Samuel Gompers, ostensibly to strengthen ties between the AFL and Latin American labor organizations.

The inter-American labor group of that period was also supposed to serve official U.S. foreign policy. The assistance from the government was offered surreptitiously to avoid an anti-administration reaction from home and abroad. The Senate report of 1968 points out that the present-day AIFLD arrangement "theoretically allows for a minimum of direct involvement in the Latin American situation on the part of State and AID officials, and thereby lessens the chances of State and AID officials becoming embroiled in the politics of Latin America. . . . The design is to insure 'clean' technical assistance for the entire democratic segment of the Latin American labor movement."

In its analysis, the Senate committee staff points out that many critics have attacked the AIFLD as a creature of the State Department. On the other hand, others complain that the AIFLD functions virtually without State Department controls, in spite of the heavy government subsidies. The Senate study appears to support the latter charge, especially since it recommends greater government supervision over the AIFLD. Actually, the question of who is controlling whom is essentially a bureaucratic matter, pressing for those involved, perhaps, but less important than the issue of overall policy upon which AIFLD activities are based. In this context the international ideology of the AFL-CIO, and for that matter of the United States is really the major issue.

This salient question the Senate report overlooks. For in calling upon the State Department and its related agencies to supersede the functions of the AIFLD, the committee staff ignores the fact that Latin American critics often object to the policy as well as the tactics of American diplomacy. At the very least, the committee staff contradicts itself when it makes such a proposal, for it also notes the Latin American allegation that the State Department manipulates for its own ends the private groups that function in the hemisphere. In his slashing critique of the report, AFL-CIO President George Meany correctly demonstrates this weakness in the study's conclusion. But the more significant flaw which the committee and Meany fail to recognize is that changing the bureaucratic arrangement will not itself alter the policy, which both acknowledge to be the common property of the AFL-CIO and the United States Government. Both groups are committed to the maintenance of dominant American interests in the region (albeit under certain reformist rules and regulations), to the notion that American-style political institutions and capitalism are essential

to a good society, and that revolutionary movements which challenge American idea and interests are unacceptable. Neither is willing nor able to see that assuring American investors "a fair return on their investment" may very well prevent the realization of any meaningful good society, democratic or otherwise, in many Latin American countries. Neither acknowledges that reformist measures, even where seriously attempted, may simply not be speedy enough or fundamental enough to produce real changes in the lives of many Latin Americans, and that in an increasing number of cases American interests are considered more secure under the aegis of conservative military regimes.

As for the unions per se, Robert Dockery, author of the first part of the Senate staff report, is perceptive when he notes that, contrary to myth, American labor has not been apolitical of a stranger to ideology. In fact, the unions have rigorously upheld the political ideology of the American private enterprise system, have usually engaged in partisan domestic politics to win economic concessions for their own constituents, supported labor movements allied with their own, and opposed unions and political parties which support ideas and actions with which they do not agree. In the past, labor based its attack against "unfriendly" unions on the ground that politics was inappropriate to trade unionism, when what it really meant was that a *particular kind* of politics was out of order because it did not agree with American labor's ideological biases. In more recent years that particular argument has not been so evident, but the essential policy has survived.

It is true that the AFL-CIO has had ties with some foreign unions which have included Socialists and supported particular Socialist measures. Without going into the content and fundamental character of the Socialist groups in question, the long history of such relationships shows that those friendships and alliances have existed for the most part when the particular foreign unions or governments have accommodated themselves to the foreign interests of the United States Government and the American unions, or when the AFL-CIO felt it had no alternative to an even more undesirable situation. When it has believed its interests to be in danger or otherwise resisted, the AFL-CIO has opposed foreign unions and governments. At present this last point is most easily demonstrated by the AFL-CIO's widening split with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) and its vigorous opposition to the Latin American Confederation of Christian Trade Unions (CLASC), a nationalist, anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist, anti-Communist organization of Latin American unionists.

Such opposition, it has been suggested, has on a number of occasions resulted in active intervention in the unions and political affairs of other countries. This has been done, it should be added, often out of a quite sincere conviction on the part of various union officials that such action was in the best interests of the country involved, as well as for the security of American unions. Since World War II, in particular, such activities have been carried on with the usual explanation that international communism was about to extinguish freedom and free trade unionism. The assumption is questionable and the Senate subcommittee staff report might have stood on more relevant ground if it had called for a revision of the criteria whereby the American labor unions and the United States Government conduct their international activities.

[From The Progressive, November 1967]

U.S. LABOR'S CONSERVATIVE ROLE IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Susanne Bodenheimer)

"Not one penny of CIA money has ever come in to the AFL or the AFL-CIO to my knowledge over the last twenty years, and I say to you if it had come in, I would know about it. . . . I take a great deal of pride in the work we've done overseas and I resent the fact that the CIA is trying to horn in on it and say that they have done some of it."—George Meany, President of AFL-CIO, denying charges of Central Intelligence Agency subsidies to AFL-CIO, May 8, 1967.

Imagine, for the moment, that George Meany is incapable of telling a lie. Suppose that the AFL-CIO's expensive campaign to promote "democratic unionism" abroad—particularly in Latin America—is not being charged to the ever-

expanding account of the "invisible government," are its motivations and methods so different from those of the CIA, and has Meany any reason to take pride in that campaign?

The apparatus of the AFL-CIO's Latin American program since World War II has been geared to a continuation of the Cold War. Through its principal instrument, the Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers (ORIT), founded in 1951 to compete with leftist and Peronist labor organizers, the AFL-CIO has constructed a network of "free and democratic" unions throughout Latin America. This is supplemented by the International Trade Secretariats (ITS), which coordinate activities among unions in the same trade or industry throughout the world. The third agency of the AFL-CIO in Latin America is the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), which brings together the resources of American labor, American business, and the U.S. Government.

Like official U.S. policy-makers, the AFL-CIO is ambivalent toward social change in Latin America and vacillates between a desire to win over Latin Americans with promises of gradual social reform and a tendency to rely on "safe"—military and oligarchic—forces which stifle even peaceful social progress. With one hand American labor holds out offers of education and financial aid, and simultaneously, with the other hand, wields the "big stick" of intervention.

A widely-advertised attraction of the AFL-CIO operation south of the Rio Grande is the AIFLD educational program, which has reached more than 60,000 Latin American unionists since 1962. Scholarships to the AIFLD Institute in the United States are awarded to the "star" pupils in local and regional AIFLD seminars, recruited and screened by AFL-CIO and ORIT representatives. After completing the three-month "advanced course" and returning to their own countries, the most promising students remain on the AIFLD payroll as "interns" for nine months.

At the end of an unpaved road in the pleasant, rolling Virginia countryside, more than seventy-five miles from Washington, D.C., is the AIFLD Institute. Originally located in Washington, it was moved to Virginia, according to AIFLD officials, to provide a "more peaceful" environment for study. Students are without cars or bus service to "the monastery," as they have nick-named it, and are seldom exposed to the distractions of the big city. None of the students I met there spoke English and few seemed engrossed in their studies.

All AIFLD students major in anti-Communism, a subject which their instructors, some of whom are Cuban exiles, are well qualified to teach. According to the *AIFLD Report*, students from several countries spend more hours in the "democracy and totalitarianism" course ("democracy" American-style, "totalitarianism" Communist-style) than on any other subject. Through "role-playing" exercises, students gain practice in countering Communist infiltration. But while AIFLD graduates have acquired expertise in ousting Communists (or anyone who looks Communist to AFL-CIO advisers), they are ill-equipped by their AIFLD education to meet equally potent challenges from rightwing dictatorial governments or entrenched land-owning and business interests. Although ninety per cent of the land in Latin America is controlled by ten per cent of the landholders, land reform receives scant attention in the AIFLD curriculum.

Central to AIFLD's program is the premise, as its director, William Doherty, put it to the Council for Latin America (an American businessmen's group) on February 11, 1966, that "The great bulk of the 15,000,000 organized workers in Latin America think, want, and desire almost identically with their counterparts in the United States." On the dubious assumption that American unionism is exportable, AFL-CIO educators have focused on "bread and butter" issues—higher wages, better working conditions, more fringe benefits—to be obtained through the collective bargaining process. Apparently they have not understood that such ameliorations, while necessary, are insufficient as objectives for Latin American workers, and cannot be attained solely through collective bargaining without structural reforms in the distribution of resources and income and the establishment of democratic process in their national governments.

Latin American workers are still fighting battles which American labor won many years ago. A mere ten to fifteen per cent of the active labor force is organized. Lacking funds and political influence, even those represented by unions are not regarded as an autonomous pressure group whose interests and needs demand serious consideration. Moreover, the rights of labor, particularly in state-run enterprises and public services, are generally limited by government

labor codes regulating wage increases, strikes, and collective bargaining. In many countries employers are required to bargain only with unions officially recognized by the government.

Particularly inappropriate as an example for Latin Americans is the AFL-CIO's outlook toward free enterprise and the big business community. As witness Doherty's words to the Council for Latin America, "We believe in the capitalist system . . . are dedicated to its preservation." Latin American unionists also oppose nationalization of industry, he continued, and, "like ourselves, they would want government to step in and interfere in the affairs of business and labor only in case of national emergency. . . ." AIFLD is symbolic of American labor's comfortable relationship with business; as Doherty said in radio interviews in December, 1963, "We welcome [the] cooperation [of management] not only financially but in terms of establishing our policies. . . . The cooperation between ourselves and the business community is getting warmer day by day."

But for Latin American workers, who confront vested and generally unprogressive industrial and land-owning interests, such benevolence toward big business would be suicidal if widely accepted. Imagine a Chilean copper miner "open-minded" enough to embrace an organization whose board included—as AIFLD's does—Charles Brinckerhoff, president of Anaconda Copper.

Those who do adopt the AFL-CIO philosophy have displayed a marked lack of militancy toward business. ORIT affiliates in several countries have fostered company unions. In many countries the AFL-CIO has encouraged its proteges to pull out of coalitions with more militant elements, even at the risk of forming parallel unions. ORIT affiliates have engaged in practices which violate even the principles of American-style unionism and which are regarded by more active Latin-American unionists as *anti-obrero*—anti-worker.

Thus the AFL-CIO has offered an educational program and a philosophy divorced from the agenda for basic social change in Latin America, in the hope of persuading Latin American workers to settle for "bread and butter unionism"—a poor substitute, at best.

Where ideas fail to convince, material assistance often becomes persuasive. American labor's access to U.S. foreign aid funds is tempting bait to impoverished Latin American unions.

Since the inception of the Alliance for Progress, the AFL-CIO has had a virtual monopoly over its union programs. Early expectations that Alliance labor funds would be available to the liberal Social Christian Trade Union Confederation of Latin America (CLASC) as well as to the reactionary ORIT were dashed, for the labor advisory committee to the Alliance included only AFL-CIO representatives, and since 1962 the AIFLD Social Projects Department has been the formal agency for channeling Alliance funds to Latin American labor.

Ironically, AFL-CIO control over Alliance funds has caused fewer problems for those excluded than for the intended beneficiaries. In one country after another, union leaders have eagerly accepted AIFLD offers of loans for housing projects, only to find that the strings attached restricted their freedom and in some cases violated national laws.

In Uruguay a \$5 million AIFLD-sponsored housing project for the ORIT-affiliated Uruguayan Labor Federation fell through when the Uruguay representatives refused to sign AIFLD's "letter of intention," naming AIFLD "as their sole agent before any . . . organization . . . for the procuring and realization of the loan," and granting AIFLD the "permanent right" to veto applicants for the project "for trade union and political reasons"—terms which violated Uruguayan law. During the planning stages of a \$3 million housing project for sugar workers in the Dominican Republic, the Inter-American Development Bank, which was to have provided two-thirds of the money, withdrew its loan in objection to AIFLD's insistence that both the construction and the occupancy of the project be restricted to unions affiliated with ORIT. In addition, AIFLD violated Dominican law by awarding contracts in a private rather than an open bidding and favored American firms. The U.S. Agency for International Development later bailed out AIFLD by financing the construction of 110 of the projected 700 to 900 units.

If their exclusion of non-ORIT unions appears narrow-minded, AIFLD officials are more flexible about cooperating with dictatorial and military regimes. This is disguised through the convenient myth of "union-to-union" programs, by which AIFLD can continue direct aid to unions under undemocratic regimes, seeming to bypass these governments. But in practice, AIFLD must deal with

governmental agencies, thereby indirectly lending moral and material support to these regimes. In Honduras, for example, after the right-wing military coup of October, 1963—even before the U.S. Government had re-established diplomatic relations—AIFLD was pressing for resumption of work on its housing project for a railroad workers' union.

In countries other than pre-Castro Cuba the AFL-CIO has urged nonaction in the face of military takeovers. Following such coups in Guatemala in 1954, in the Dominican Republic and Honduras in 1963, and in Brazil in 1964, ORIT-affiliated unions, acting on AFL-CIO advice, refused to join other unions in general strikes or even verbal protests, on the grounds that repressive action would be taken against unions expressing opposition. In addition, AFL-CIO officials explain, "Unions should not become involved in partisan causes or use strikes as political weapons."

Such official AFL-CIO ideology notwithstanding, the rhetoric of "apolitical unionism" is discarded and overtly partisan actions taken when expediency requires. Soon after the 1964 coup in Brazil, AIFLD Director Doherty told radio interviewers, "I am certainly not against Brazilian labor getting involved in politics." Apparently not, for at the time of the coup AIFLD graduates were active in mobilizing labor support for it and in ensuring its success. As Doherty boasted, "Some of [the unionists trained at AIFLD] . . . became involved in some of the clandestine operations of the revolution before it took place on April 1. . . ." Doherty's claim has been proudly confirmed by other AFL-CIO officials I interviewed and other popularizers of the so-called "revolution" by which the military overthrew President Goulart's government.

An October, 1966, *Reader's Digest* article related that one AIFLD-trained communications union leader ran seminars in Brazil in which "he warned key workers of coming trouble and urged them to keep communications going, no matter what happened," as a result when the call went out in April, 1964, for a general strike to protest the coup, "the wires kept humming and the army was able to coordinate troop movements that ended the showdown bloodlessly. . . ." Just as they had landed the CIA-instigated takeover in Guatemala ten years previously, AFL-CIO officials endorsed the Brazilian coup. For two and one half years American labor continued to support the military regime, although its anti-inflation measures and strict regulation of wages, its severe strike laws, and its purge of union leadership greatly weakened Brazilian labor.

In the Dominican Republic, those same "non-partisan" ORIT-dominated labor officials who refused to fight during the 1965 revolution, had no qualms earlier about participating in the political activities which helped bring down the Bosch regime in 1963. In his memoirs, former President Bosch singled out leaders of the Dominican ORIT affiliate as openly favoring the coup against him.

In British Guiana the AFL-CIO participated directly in a three-year campaign to oust the constitutionally elected government of Cheddi Jagan, through assistance to the British Guiana Trades Union Council (TUC)—the anti-Jagan ORIT affiliate which worked closely with Forbes Burnham's People's National Congress (PNC), the principal opposition party to Jagan.

AFL-CIO leaders and their Guianese proteges were deeply implicated in the terrorism and racial violence which accompanied the strike. A secret report of September, 1963, from the British police superintendent in British Guiana to the British Commissioner, named Gerard O'Keefe of the Retail Clerks International Association as having financed the activities of the "security force" (organized gangs) of Burnham's PNC—including assassinations and destruction of public buildings "with explosives and arson."

The British Guiana operation indicates clearly that the AFL-CIO is not squeamish in devising means for the pursuit of Cold War political objectives disguised in the cloak of "free and democratic unionism." In addition, it suggests that George Meany has not been straightforward about labor's dealings with the CIA. The convincing evidence that the AFL-CIO served as a front for the CIA in British Guiana, as described in *The Progressive* (April, 1967), makes more credible the revelations that many American union international programs have been operating in Latin America largely on CIA funds, channeled through "dummy" foundations. Senator J. W. Fulbright told labor columnist Victor Riesel in August, 1966, "I have had suggestions that they [the CIA] had taken a very strong part in labor union organization in the Dominican Republic."

If Communism did not exist, someone in the AFL-CIO would have had to invent it. For the AFL-CIO's frequently stated justification of its dubious political activities has been that they help to provide a democratic alternative to

Communist influence in Latin American unions. Yet its primary rivals in Latin America today—and the main targets of its criticism—*have not been the Communists but other non-Communist unions*. This has been disguised by the AFL-CIO's use of the Communist issue to smear its non-Communist, democratic-leftist rivals with the red brush.

Chief target of its red-baiting attacks has been the Social Christian Confederation, CLASC. Joe Beirne, head of the Communications Workers of America, for example, stated in a 1963 news conference: "[CLASC has] been infiltrated and I think captured by the Communists. . . ." But CLASC's record speaks for itself. To CLASC, Communism and capitalism alike are forms of materialism, repugnant to the basic precepts of Social Christian doctrine. Both treat unions in the developing nations as pawns in the Cold War, "tools to be employed for gaining political power," says CLASC, and both are alien and irrelevant ideologies for Latin Americans. Emilio Maspero, CLASC Secretary-General, stated at a 1963 conference at the University of Notre Dame that, "The Communist influence has been more inimical still [than the American] to autonomous Latin American labor organizations. . . ."

Closer to the heart of the AFL-CIO's grudge against CLASC is Inter-American director Andrew McLellan's complaint that "[The Social Christians] are not interested in bread and butter issues such as we are." It is not pro-Communism or advocacy of violence, but the unequivocal commitment to peaceful but thoroughgoing social revolution, and the firm refusal to confine itself to "bread and butter" issues, for which AFL-CIO officials cannot forgive CLASC. CLASC's existence and growing appeal for workers in many countries present a challenge and a threat to the AFL-CIO, merely by dramatizing the need for a more satisfactory alternative to Communism than American labor has been able to offer.

Why has the AFL-CIO—potentially a progressive force—failed to provide an impetus toward vitally-needed structural reforms in Latin America? Why has it wielded its influence in defense of the status quo, often on behalf of those who stifle workers' rights? The answers involve both personalities and the position of organized labor in American society today.

The AFL-CIO international program bears the stamp of those few individuals who have been its chief architects. Imbued with the Cold War mentality of an era when the overseas representatives of American unions fought their Communist counterparts in Europe, several of these individuals have remained active in the network of anti-Communist organizations, venturing even into the camp of the Far Right. Jay Lovestone, foreign policy adviser to George Meany and one of America's most ardent converts from Communism, has had ties with the American Security Council, the Council against Communist Aggression, and the Citizens' Committee for a Free Cuba (to mention only a few). Meany has been in various "China lobby" organizations and on the advisory council of the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order (FRASCO), which claims to wage a "spiritual offensive against Communism." Serafino Romualdi, formerly head of AFL-CIO Inter-American Affairs and director of AIFLD, was scheduled as a speaker for the Washington "school" of Fred Schwarz's Christian Anti-Communist Crusade in 1964. He addressed the 1962 "All-American Conference to Combat Communism" (as Lovestone had done in 1961) and he has been on the Cuban Freedom Committee, the Committee of One Million, and similar groups.

But of greater import has been American labor's acquired position vis-a-vis the American business community. As one labor expert has commented, "Today Big Labor and Big Management [in the U.S.] often deal with each other as affluent fellow corporate groups." Indeed, the AFL-CIO's Latin American program has enjoyed consistent and strong support from certain sectors of the American business community. It is doubtful that management's enthusiasm is motivated purely by altruism. One union official suggested candidly to me that big businessmen see an opportunity to mold one segment of Latin American labor in such a way as to minimize the threat from labor to private American investment. Certainly, American business has a sympathetic partner in the AFL-CIO. As the labor committee report to the 1965 White House Conference on International Cooperation state, "[AIFLD] seeks to provide an atmosphere conducive to free enterprise [in Latin America]."

Equally striking but less well known has been the integration of the AFL-CIO international department into the U.S. foreign policy establishment. Exactly because American labor's objectives have become generally indistinguishable from those of the State Department, the alleged rationale for the AFL-CIO's

international program—to create “union-to-union” bonds between popularly-based institutions in the “free world” and in developing nations—has been undermined.

To the small clique which runs AFL-CIO international affairs, the close relationship with Federal policymakers has brought certain concrete returns: access to U.S. foreign aid funds; heightened individual prestige in official circles; a measure of influence over policy; and patronage (for example, candidates for labor attaches in U.S. embassies are frequently recommended, and must always be approved, by Meany and Lovestone). In return, particularly because it passes as a private organization, the AFL-CIO has proved a valuable partner for official policy-makers. Whereas the latter are formally accountable to Congress and the interested public, the AFL-CIO is largely immune from public oversight—even though AID has poured \$15.5 million of taxpayers' money into AIFLD. Labor's “private” nature also enhances labor's usefulness to the “invisible government.” Thus, perhaps unwittingly, American labor has fallen into some of the very habits which it recognizes and denounces in Communist-dominated unions.

Unlikely as it is that AFL-CIO foreign policy would be totally divorced from that of the U.S. Government, one might expect the representatives of labor to exert a liberalizing influence. In fact they have done just the opposite. When given a choice between a liberal direction or an interventionist, “negative anti-Communist” one, the AFL-CIO has reinforced the latter. Just as its rigid anti-Communism has undermined State Department initiatives for building bridges to the Eastern European bloc, the AFL-CIO's negative attitude has inhibited overtures to Latin American Christian Democrats. And at a time when the State Department was, to all appearances, supporting the democratic leftist Bosch regime in the Dominican Republic, the Dominican ORIT affiliate, with strong AFL-CIO backing, was actively plotting its overthrow.

Asked by newsmen recently whether the AFL-CIO has made any mistakes abroad, Meany modestly replied, “We haven't found a single thing we would not say again.” Clearly there will be no significant changes in AFL-CIO policy under the present leadership. Would it suffice, then, to remove the hard-liners like Meany and Lovestone? I think not. The habits which the AFL-CIO has acquired in dealing with labor in developing nations are not quickly unlearned. Moreover, the Meany and Lovestones could not have been so successful at their own game, but for the willing cooperation of many of American labor's “liberals.”

In the United States, AFL-CIO lobbying for increased foreign aid allotments to AIFLD establishes its “liberal” credentials; in Latin America such aid represents a form of intervention disguised in humanitarian rhetoric. To American liberals the AFL-CIO's conservatism is bad judgment on the part of well-intentioned men; to Latin Americans it seems part of a plan to perpetuate their dependence on the United States.

If this is the best that American liberalism has to offer, it merely proves that American liberalism ends at the borders of the United States. Like the “liberal” American students and philanthropists who compromised themselves with the CIA in the name of anti-Communism, the representatives of American labor have confirmed the bankruptcy of American “liberalism” for Latin Americans.

[From The Nation, Feb. 10, 1964]

DUBIOUS ROLE OF AFL-CIO—MEDDLING IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Stanley Meisler)

The Alliance for Progress, whatever it signifies for Latin America, has meant for American labor an alliance with government and big business. American labor has never minced words about the unions of the Soviet Union. “The so-called trade unions in the USSR,” the AFL-CIO Executive Council has proclaimed, “are nothing but agencies of the Communist dictatorship.” The implication, sharp and clear, has always been: Unions of America are anything but agencies of government and big business. That has been a pride of American labor, but the new alliance raises questions that may make that pride ring a bit hollow.

British Guiana is a good place to begin. American Government, business and labor have never been happy with the leftist administration of Cheddi Jagan that took office after the August, 1961, elections in the British colony. American woes and worries have multiplied with the approach of independence. The AFL-

CIO boasts of its part in helping the trade unions there battle the Jagan government. "In British Guiana," said a recent union advertisement, "the AFL-CIO has rendered generous aid to the free trade unions resisting the attempt of the pro-Communist Jagan regime to destroy their independence." On the surface, American labor has moved into British Guiana to help brother unions fight communism. But the situation in British Guiana is far more complicated than that, and its "generous aid" has involved the AFL-CIO in racial and political strife. In addition, not all the aid given by the AFL-CIO has come from the labor treasury.

In British Guiana, as elsewhere in Latin America, the AFL-CIO has operated with money supplied by the United States Government and big business. It is no secret: the AFL-CIO glows about its partnership with government and business in fighting communism in this hemisphere. Anyone expressing concern about the notion of an American labor movement becoming tangled in the pursue strings of government and industry is pooh-hoohed as a silly left-winger.

To the United States, Jagan's Guiana looks like a budding twin of Castro's Cuba. In 1961, Jagan's People's Progressive Party (PPT), supported mostly by the colony's 269,000 East Indians, took 42.7 per cent of the vote and twenty of the thirty-five seats in the legislature. Forbes Burnham's People's National Congress (PNC), supported mostly by the 187,000 Negroes, took 41 per cent of the vote and eleven seats. Peter D'Aguiar's United Force, supported mostly by businessmen, the 66,000 Portuguese and other mixed racial groups, took 16 percent of the vote and four seats. Since then, American money has been shipped into the colony in support of the two opposition parties.

D'Aguiar's United Force has received money from radical Right organizations. Fred Schwarz's Christian Anti-Communist Crusade which is now appealing for more money to fight Jagan, channels funds to D'Aguiar. The AFL-CIO has pumped its funds into the Guianese trade unions, largely Negro and urban, which are the backbone of Burnham's PNC.

In addition, the AFL-CIO and the international organization under its influence have sent representatives into the colony to train the Guianese in American-style unionism, and have selected more than a dozen anti-Jagan union leaders for more intensive schooling in the United States. Much of this education program has been managed by the American Institute for Free Labor Development, an enterprise run by the AFL-CIO, partly with its own funds but principally with money made available by the Alliance for Progress and private enterprise. The institute has become an important arm of AFL-CIO operations in Latin America.

The strategy of Burnham and his union supporters has been to demand that Britain delay independence until there is a new election based on proportional representation, which would give Burnham almost the same number of seats in the legislature as Jagan and, possibly, the premiership or a partnership with Jagan. Jagan's strategy has been to oppose proportional representation and to break the unions. Last April, when Jagan's party tried to push through legislation that in the view of his opponents would give him control over the unions, the British Guiana Trade Union Council called a general strike. This strike, supported by the AFL-CIO, lasted eleven violent, murderous weeks and turned into a succession of race riots between Negroes and Indians. The end seemed a union victory: Jagan withdrew his legislation, and the British decided to delay independence.

In June, Jagan wrote a letter to *The New York Times*, giving his view of the events:

Considerable evidence exists that the strike is not industrial but rather politically inspired by the opposition and by business elements opposed to the government's program of social and economic reform. . . . Local trade unionists known to be hostile to the government—and none others—have been trained by the American Institute for Free Labor Development to overthrow my government. Serafino Romualdi, head of the Institute, has described his opposition to my government. The Trade Union Council campaign of passive resistance organized by U.S.-trained unionists is openly supported by the opposition parties and has led to racial violence.

A month later, Jagan amplified these charges, telling the Associated Press that the American Institute for Free Labor Development had given the Trade Union Council \$2 million for a housing scheme and that other sources had contributed \$1.2 million to the trade unions of British Guiana during the strike.

Romualdi, in a statement, replied that when he had last visited British Guiana in April, 1962,

... it appeared to me that young democratic trade union leaders would need intensive training to combat Dr. Jagan's efforts. Subsequently, eight Guianese came to Washington in June, 1962, as participants in the institute's first course. In September of that year, six of these men returned to British Guiana, supported by AIFLD internships, enabling them to put into practice, on a full-time basis, what they had learned at our school. . . . When the BGTUC decided to call a general strike in an attempt to prevent passage of Dr. Jagan's labor bill, I was asked to put the institute's six interns, who were working with various local unions, at the disposal of the council's strike committee. . . . In agreement with the institute's Secretary-Treasurer, Joseph A. Beirne, I instructed the interns to fully devote their efforts to supporting the strike, and extended their internships, which were scheduled to end on June 15, to August 15. . . . I would like to say that I am proud of our graduates in British Guiana. In spite of sacrifices and hardships they kept their places in the front lines of a difficult and, unfortunately, sometimes bloody battle.

The institute said that while it discussed possible housing aid it never gave the BGTUC \$2 million for a housing project or contributed \$1.2 million to the strike coffers. Other U.S. labor sources, while agreeing that the institute did not make the contribution, say that the \$1.2 million figure probably does not exaggerate the amount of American labor money that went into British Guiana during the strike.

The British Guiana strike and the charges of Jagan first drew wide notice to the American Institute for Free Labor Development. Today, the institute has become a main way for the AFL-CIO to carry out its Latin American good works, and it may become the model for AFL-CIO activities in other parts of the underdeveloped world. Its rapid development is an interesting story of present-day unionism.

Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, sold the idea of the institute to the AFL-CIO. In 1957, his union had invited sixteen Latin American communications workers to the CWA's education center at Front Royal, Va., for a three-month course in American-style unionism. When the Latins returned home, the Postal, Telephone and Telegraph International—the organization that links the CWA with other communications unions in the world—paid them salaries for nine months so that they could work as full-time unionists. In 1960, Beirne convinced the AFL-CIO council that it should expand this experiment into an ambitious program. By October, 1961, the institute was functioning, and Serafino Romualdi, for years the AFL-CIO's Inter-American representative, was named director.

The institute does not publish full financial details, but it is known that its 1963 budget was for \$1,141,500. The institute says this income came from three sources: \$500,000 or so from government, \$300,000 or so from the AFL-CIO, and \$300,000 or so from foundations and business. All the government funds, according to the institute, came from the Alliance for Progress program. The institute is also close-mouthed about its private donors and the size of their contributions. But representatives from W. R. Grace & Co., Pan American Airways, the Anaconda Company, and the Rockefeller Foundation are on the board of trustees, and the institute offers their names when asked for a sampling of contributors. The United Fruit Co., symbol of imperialistic big business to many Central Americans, is not a supporter, but the institute has said that it would accept United Fruit money if it were offered.

Big business has backed the institute for reasons of enlightened selfishness. The days of economic imperialism seem numbered in Latin America; Castroism and communism loom. The AFL-CIO has convinced the businessmen that their only hope of surviving—though less arrogantly than of old—lies in a powerful, free, anti-Communist trade-union movement that protects the worker and siphons away his discontent. The companies, of course, proclaim more lofty motives, "We are very much in sympathy with the stated aims of the American Institute for Free Labor Development," says Julian L. Hayes, publicity manager for The Anaconda Company, which has extensive copper interests in Chile. "I am sure Mr. Serafino Romualdi is fighting for what he believes to be the rights of the laboring man in free societies. In free societies, there are rights for the expressions of organized labor and equal opportunities for management to be heard . . . under law. Under a monolithic system, there is no freedom. We believe in freedom and the dignity of man."

The institute has two main activities—social projects and education. The social projects department, headed by William C. Doherty, Jr., has mushroomed in to a prosperous agency of the Alliance for Progress. Although the financial

arrangements, are cloudy, it seems that the institute sets aside only government funds for the social projects department. Much of its work, in fact, is under direct contract with the Agency for International Development.

Doherty's department helps unions throughout Latin America to plan housing projects, worker co-ops, credit unions, banks, apprentice schools and other union projects, and to borrow in the United States the money necessary to build them. In the first fourteen months, the department received requests for help on 107 union projects. It has not had the time or resources to take care of all these requests, but during the period it did help Latin American unions obtain \$13 million in AFL-CIO loans for housing in Mexico, Peru and El Salvador. Up to now, offices have been open only in Colombia, Peru and Chile, but the department plans to open more this year in Argentina, Bolivia, Mexico, Jamaica, Venezuela, Uruguay, Ecuador and El Salvador.

The housing loan to Mexico, probably the department's most important project so far, illustrates how this activity of the American Institute for Free Labor Development works. The institute and the Graphic Arts Workers Union of Mexico drew plans for a \$14 million housing project of ninety-seven buildings, containing 3,000 two- and three-bedroom apartments, at Colonia Jardin Balbuena in the center of Mexico City. The average price for an apartment would be \$3,300 with monthly payments ranging from \$22 to \$48. The AFL-CIO used its reserve funds to lend \$10 million to the Mexican union as soon as the AID agreed to guarantee full repayment of the loan in dollars. Construction began last December and is scheduled to be finished in August—all under the management of the institute's social projects department. When finished, the homes will be known as the "John F. Kennedy Memorial Workers' Housing Project."

Despite the impressive scale of such projects, however, education is the main business of the institute. Since opening in June, 1962, its Washington school has trained 181 labor leaders from thirty-one Latin American nations and colonies. The interns usually receive a stipend when they return home so that they can devote themselves full time to unionism for at least nine months. In addition, the institute has set up schools or traveling instructor programs in eleven countries, and has trained more than 1,800 labor leaders on the spot. The Washington course covers United States political structure, the economics of underdevelopment, the history of the AFL-CIO, collective bargaining procedures, organizing methods, union finances, communism, dictatorship, Latin American militarism, consumer cooperatives, the history of the international labor movement, and analyses of labor movements in various nations.

The institute insists that no attempt is made to propagandize the Latin Americans. One graduate, José Dolores Bautista of the Dominican Republic, has answered charges of brainwashing by saying: "I am very happy to be brainwashed in the free, friendly and comradely manner in which we are being brainwashed at the institute."

With Latin America so volatile, it would be difficult for the institute to stay clear of politics, even if it wanted to. British Guiana is one country where the institute became enmeshed in politics; Honduras is another. The military overthrow of the government of President Ramon Villeda Morales forced the institute into some definite political decisions, but its presence had been felt earlier in Honduras. Two graduates, Andres Victor Antiles and Santiago Pineda Puerto, wrested control of the Standard Fruit Company Workers Union from the Communists last August. About the same time, builders finished the first ten homes of a 102-house union project financed by AID and handled by the institute. In October, when the military junta took power, the institute found that some union leaders wanted to call a general strike against the new government. An institute official says that "Institute personnel urged union leaders to hold back a general strike on the basis that the Honduran Government at that point appeared to be determined to meet any opposition with extreme measures." The institute, on the ground of the workers' needs, also tried to persuade AID to continue the housing project, despite the State Department's decision to suspend all economic aid programs to the new government. AID did not listen to the institute, but, when the United States finally recognized the military government, the housing project was the first AID program to be resumed. The military government, however did not seem to appreciate the institute's efforts. It closed down an AID-institute training school in Tela and, according to the institute, seized some of the study materials and burnt them as "Communist."

The institute is not often scorned as "Communist." Its anti-Communist rigidity and its ties with American capital have caused it far more difficulty in Latin

America. The Catholic trade union movement, for one, will have nothing to do with it. One institute spokesman admits that ties with big business "hurt us at the start, but it's coming to be accepted more and more."

Nothing in the institute's operations has provoked any evident concern at the White House or the State Department. The AFL-CIO has received only lavish praise for its efforts in Latin America. John F. Kennedy told the AFL-CIO convention last fall: "I want to express my appreciation for the actions which this organization has taken under the leadership of Mr. Meany, both at home and abroad, to strengthen the United States, to make it possible in this hemisphere for labor organizations to be organized so that wealth can be more fairly distributed." President Johnson, in his December 16 letter to Assistant Secretary of State Thomas C. Mann, said "I want you to work closely with private United States groups and institutions carrying out activities in Latin America." He then listed several groups. The AFL-CIO topped the list.

The word in Washington is that George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO and of the American Institute for Free Labor Development, is prouder of the institute than of any other international operation of American labor. Without doubt, the institute's activities and directions clearly reflect the philosophy of Meany and of his closest adviser on international affairs, Jay Lovestone. Meany told the Chicago Executives Club last year:

We have come a long way from the days of banana republics, when American companies . . . made their deals with local tyrants, without regard to the welfare of the population. Mr. [J. Peter] Grace [president of W. R. Grace & Co. and chairman of the institute's board] and others like him are well aware that the choice today is between democracy and Castroism; and that if democracy is to win, it must meet the needs and the desires of the people, starting with a higher standard of living. . . . While unions and management may quarrel over the terms of a contract, while the AFL-CIO and business spokesmen may be deeply divided on a wide range of domestic issues, from fiscal policy to federal housing, they should stand together in the great struggle of our times, the struggle that will determine the future and perhaps the survival of mankind.

Words like these are what have drawn big business to Meany's institute. Henry S. Woodbridge, board chairman of the True Temper Corporation and a trustee of the institute, says "U.S. business support of the institute is directly due to George Meany's feeling, which he has expressed many times, that without free labor you cannot have free enterprise, and without free enterprise you cannot have free labor."

It is not difficult to see the imprint of Jay Lovestone, the AFL-CIO's international affairs director, on the operations of the institute, particularly in its fervent anti-Jaganism in British Guiana. Lovestone, once leader of the Communist Party in the United States, long ago transformed himself into one of the most rabid anti-Communists within the labor movement. Meany's closeness to Lovestone has been a powerful irritant to Walter Reuther, the AFL-CIO vice president who headed the CIO before the merger, and to his brother, Victor Reuther, international affairs director of the United Auto Workers. *The New York Times*, after identifying the Reuthers as Lovestone's opposition, had this to say about Lovestone recently: "To his enemies, Mr. Lovestone is a sinister figure, who, they say, has soured the relationships between the AFL-CIO and other free world trade unions by unnecessary intrigue and bitter feuding. They say that the single-mindedness of his anti-communism has put him in essentially a negative position that has made it impossible for him to work out positive programs that really would counter the Communists."

The Reuthers are said to have three main objections to the institute's operations. They feel that it has no business engaging in Central Intelligence Agency-type activities, that it hurts American labor by its rigid anti-Communist policies, and that it has no right to commit American labor to Anaconda and Grace and other giants of American economic imperialism. But the Reuthers are unwilling to endanger the CIO's merger with the AFL by making an issue out of the institute. They have said nothing publicly about their misgivings and Walter Reuther is a member of the institute's board of trustees.

The refusal of the Reuthers to make this a public issue has meant that no one so far has raised any questions about the way the institute has shaped its course. The silence is unfortunate, for pertinent questions need to be asked.

First, is it the business of the AFL-CIO to overthrow governments? Does the United States Government really want the AFL-CIO to serve as a junior CIA?

American labor takes on such functions when it enters a British colony in aid of an opposition party trying to bring down the government. Senator Wayne Morse bellowed long and loud at American business firms for their part in the overthrow of President Juan Bosch of the Dominican Republic. "We cannot justify at any time any intermingling, intervention, muddling or meddling on the part of American businessmen abroad with American foreign policy," Morse told the Senate. It might seem that meddling by labor—even by labor mixed up with business and government—is as deplorable.

Second, can American labor really do a job in Latin America when it links itself in the minds of the peoples there with our government and business? In 1959, the University of Chicago's Research Center in Economic Development and Cultural Change, reporting to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on ways American labor can help U.S. foreign policy, wrote that "in the light of historical experience, any suspicion that U.S. union activity is under the control or influence of the State Department or other official authorities would be disastrous." The report also recommended that financial assistance to unions should originate exclusively with workers' organizations. "We cannot advocate that trade unionism be independent of governments elsewhere, and at the same time blur the distinction between U.S. labor and U.S. Government."

It is hard, too, to believe that Latin Americans will trust an American labor movement that works hand in glove with organizations like Anaconda and Grace. In fact, any Latin American labor organization that accepts institute assistance may make itself easy prey for the Communists. "How far can or should a U.S. firm go in encouraging anti-Communist but free unions?" The University of Chicago report asked. "This is obviously a most delicate issue. Clear and substantial and open support on the part of the company would turn the union into a company-dominated 'yellow' union and, at the same time, in the sociological climate of Latin America, make such an organization an easy target for Communist and possibly nationalist propaganda."

The whole operation of the institute lays it open to Communist charges that it is doing the bidding of the U.S. Government and of big business, and a campaign like the one in British Guiana makes the charges very easy to accept.

Third, has the AFL-CIO made intelligent decisions about whom to support or reject? Has communism really suffered setbacks under the onslaught of the AFL-CIO? It seems inevitable, for example, that Cheddi Jagan will rule an independent Guiana some day, for no other reason than the fact that the East Indian population is increasing at a faster rate than the Negro [see "British Guiana: Prelude to Independence" by T. E. M. McKitterick, *The Nation*, Sept. 28, 1963]. In addition, despite the general strike and the AFL-CIO money, his followers are making inroads in the trade unions.

And even if the AFL-CIO did succeed in ousting Jagan, it might have to worry as much about his probable successor, Forbes Burnham. Ved Prakash Vatuk of Colorado State University wrote in a pamphlet for the Monthly Review Press last year: "It is difficult to see where he and Jagan differ ideologically, even on the question of the desirability of 'socialism.'" This was echoed by Associated Press correspondent Robert Berrellez, who wrote from Georgetown last June: "Pointing up the prevailing theory that the country is split racially rather than politically is the fact that, fundamentally, there is little ideological difference in the platforms of Jagan and Burnham." Some political observers predict that Burnham, who once was a lieutenant of Jagan in the PPP, will return to the fold one day, and then where will the anti-Communist institute and its graduates be?

There is nothing wrong with American labor's using its resources and experience to help unions and workers in Latin America. There is little to criticize, in fact, in the institute's social projects program. Labor should take part in the Alliance for Progress and, with no hesitation, accept government guarantees on its loans to Latin American unions. But American labor should not play CIA and try to overthrow governments. American labor should not dilute its effectiveness by operating in Latin America on a budget that is supplied by the U.S. Government and big business. "We in the AFL-CIO," George Meany has said, "do not even try to influence the structure of the labor movements in other nations. We teach the fundamentals of union operation; but how the pieces are put together is up to the people involved." U.S. labor should live up to that boast.

[From The Nation, Jan. 16, 1967]

LOVESTONE, MEANY & STATE—AMERICAN LABOR OVERSEAS

(By Henry W. Berger)

When the AFL-CIO Executive Council, at its meeting in Chicago last August, offered complete and unequivocal support of President Johnson's position in Vietnam, asserting that criticism of the war "can only pollute and poison the bloodstream of our democracy," it was remaining loyal to a conservative foreign policy which the country's major labor organization has followed from the start. This outlook is characteristic of George Meany and his chief adviser on international affairs, Jay Lovestone (director of the AFL-CIO International Affairs Department), as well as Irving Brown, William C. Doherty, Jr., and Andrew C. McLellan. These men have long been associated with the AFL wing of the giant labor confederation and, in active collaboration with the United States Government, they largely determine labor's foreign policy. Moreover, they conduct these very substantial overseas activities almost entirely without consulting the rank-and-file workers who help to subsidize them. To be sure, the International Affairs Department dutifully reports its activities to annual AFL-CIO conventions and throughout the year issues a voluminous barrage of publications. The reports usually either hail the accomplishments of labor's international efforts or warn of the ever-present danger that communism will sweep the free trade union movement of the world. Such rhetoric, however, does not stem from any views the members themselves may have. Instead, the workers tend to accept what the leaders tell them.

The main tenets of organized labor's present foreign policy were established in the early days of the AFL under the leadership of Samuel Gompers. Significant departures from the essential guidelines were nearly always forced responses to specific external events, rather than fundamental and permanent changes in ideas. Nor has successive leadership produced any noticeable shifts in policy.

The major exception to the general truth of this proposition was the international outlook of the CIO unions that broke from the AFL in the 1930s. On the whole, the CIO tended to be less doctrinaire, more flexible, more willing to recognize that changes could be produced by indigenous social conditions, and were not always directed from Moscow. This viewpoint helps to explain the present strain between the leadership of the two major components of the AFL-CIO.

From the beginning, the AFL viewed the international scene in terms of such narrow domestic bread-and-butter issues as overseas competition from cheap labor, and cheap goods. Consequently, the federation habitually endorsed measures that would protect it from competition, including immigration restriction, improved world-wide labor standards and, for much of its history, high tariffs on many items produced by constituent unions. But these goals were tied to an outlook which increasingly emphasized the virtues of business unionism, championed liberal capitalism, espoused a conservative trade union program, promoted the export of an AFL style of union, and resisted alternative labor ideologies.

It cannot be denied that the AFL helped to create unions in some areas where virtually no labor movement had existed. This was particularly true in Latin America. In time, it was believed, this development would benefit labor in the United States because the foreign unions would reduce the competition of cheap labor as they forced higher wages from employers. Moreover, higher wages would mean a larger market for many goods produced by union members in the United States. But the unions which the AFL promoted abroad were either patterned after the AFL unions themselves or were politically allied with the American labor federation. Finally, in a number of instances the federation sponsored unions to compete with an already existing labor movement. It initiated activities in other countries wherever and whenever it had the resources to do so, and increasingly collaborated with the United States Government in pursuit of common foreign policy objectives.

Records to document these tendencies exist from as early as the first decades of the century and continue to the present. The work of AFL organizers in Latin America and the Pacific after the Spanish-American War, Samuel Gompers' close association with the foreign policy of Woodrow Wilson, and union efforts (temporarily unsuccessful) in Europe during and immediately following World War 1 are but highlights of this long and conscious involvement in foreign affairs. The

death of Gompers and the coming of the depression served momentarily to check labor's foreign activities, but there was no shift in basic policies. What changed was the degree of involvement.

In fact, the AFL's ultraconservative posture was confirmed and its efforts to influence the shape of overseas labor movements and official United States policy were renewed and intensified when the CIO emerged as a competitive force in the mid-1930's. While part of this attitude was in response to CIO activities abroad, especially in Latin America, the *character* of AFL policy was of its own making. William Green, then president of the federation, and his associates, Matthew Woll, John Frey, Chester Wright and George Meany, strongly opposed the progressive and nationalist Confederation of Mexican Workers (CTM), led by the Marxist-oriented Vicente Lombardo Toledano, and the oil-nationalization program of the Lázaro Cárdenas regime—both of which were endorsed by the CIO. The federation chose instead to support the impotent and conservative Regional Confederation of Mexican Workers (CROM) and those in the State Department who tried to resist the nationalization decrees.

This conservative position was repeated throughout Latin America, Europe and Asia during and after World War II. To be sure, the AFL was an early and vigorous opponent of Fascist and other right-wing authoritarian regimes which set out to destroy *all* trade unions. But it tended to tolerate, and sometimes to embrace, reactionary regimes that were vigorously anti-Communist and that permitted AFL-supported unions to function. Such was the situation after the war in Greece, in the Caribbean and Central America, in Bolivia and in China. Moreover, as the fighting ended, the AFL's campaign in Western Europe, Latin America, and Asia received political and economic support from Washington.

Some of this union-government cooperation held over from labor involvement in wartime agencies, especially the Office of Inter-American Affairs (OIAA), headed by Nelson Rockefeller. Men associated with the AFL, among them John Herling, Serafino Romualdi (later in charge of the federation's Inter-American Affairs), Robert J. Watt and David Dubinsky, had either official or unofficial ties with the OIAA. Irving Brown, who probably did more than any other single person to promote AFL objectives in Europe and Africa after 1944, began this involvement as director of the Labor and Manpower Division of the Foreign Economic Administration (FEA) in which he served during the critical months of April to September, 1945. Brown then resigned from the FEA because he believed that American policy makers in Germany were promoting labor policies which, in his words, served "the interests of the Soviet Union." But this disagreement did not terminate Brown's work for the AFL in Europe, nor end AFL cooperation with the government. In fact, the relationship was eventually formalized and the government leaned increasingly toward the AFL point of view in foreign labor matters.

It is important to emphasize that AFL agents were proselytizing in Latin America, Asia and Europe well before it can be seriously argued that the Soviet Union was in any active sense intervening in those areas on behalf of Communist labor leadership. Soviet support and direction came after local Communists were already involved in unions on their own, as in France and Italy. Moreover, as even conservative journalists reported, the Communists in Western Europe were quite moderate and cooperated with non-Communist groups until 1947, when East-West relations turned exceedingly cold. The AFL intervened vigorously prior to these developments and did so on its own initiative. The intervention was surreptitious and designed to undermine labor elements already in existence or emerging from the chaos of World War II.

In Latin America the federation simply renewed its historical involvement. George Meany was sent to Mexico in December, 1944, to investigate the possibilities of working with conservative elements of the Mexican CTM in opposition to Vicente Lombardo Toledano and the hemispheric Confederation of Latin American Workers (CTAL) which he now headed. The AFL had changed its position toward the CTM because it was clearly the dominant Mexican union and because it contained conservative men with whom the AFL might be able to join hands.

While the U.S. Department of State officially divorced itself from Meany's venture, it in fact gave assistance and encouragement. Meany reported on his findings to George S. Messersmith, the American Ambassador to Mexico. A year later, Serafino Romualdi, the official Inter-American representative, traveled extensively through Latin America to seek support for a labor federation that would rival the CTAL. His trip was in part underwritten with public funds, since his

JOHN H. O'LEARY

ostensible reason for going south was to represent American labor at the regional International Labor Organization (ILO) Conference in Mexico City. State had a say in planning the rest of Romualdi's itinerary.

These events were followed by increased consultation between AFL and State Department officials, in particular Romualdi, Assistant Secretary of State Spruille Braden, and the chief of the division of labor attachés, Daniel Horowitz. From these meetings emerged the Inter-American Confederation of Labor (CIT), predecessor to the present-day Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers (ORIT).

In Europe, the ALF set out to establish anti-Communist cadres through heavy financial assistance, generous political advice and widespread underground activities. Its major instrument was the Free Trade Union Committee (FTUC) whose executive secretary was Jay Lovestone. Lovestone's chief man in Europe was Irving Brown. The method of operation was simple—dual unionism. Thus in France the AFL urged unions to split from the General Confederation of Labor (CGT), and materially assisted the formation of the rival *Force Ouvrière* (F.O.).

Brown also intervened in French strikes. The most famous of these episodes was a strike against the delivery of American arms at French ports in 1949–50. Brown supplied the funds and the manpower to get the material landed and thus helped to defeat the unions involved.

In France, as elsewhere in Europe, AFL showed little patience with those who saw distinctions between various factions of the Left or who refused to consider all Communists mere Kremlin robots. Thus a long-time labor attaché to Paris, Richard Eldridge—whose knowledge of French labor was extraordinary, and who suggested a more flexible policy in dealing with the French Left—ran into the opposition of the AFL "activists." The whole story of Eldridge, who seems to have had the confidence of American Ambassador Jefferson Caffery, will probably never be known, but he is proof that not all American officials shared the AFL's almost theological view of foreign labor matters.

In Italy, Brown and Harry Goldberg opposed Socialists as well as Communists, and helped to splinter the labor movement in that country too. Similar courses were followed in Greece, Germany and the Orient. Richard Deverall, the top AFL figure in Japan, had previously served with the American military government. The AFL also sent him to India, and Harry Goldberg moved from Italy to Indonesia. The available evidence suggests that a great deal of money was pumped into these missions and that it came from government sources as well as from the AFL.

No one disputes the right of the AFL to take whatever political stand its judgment dictates. But what was so disturbing about the ventures cited above was the means the leadership used to approach its goals. First, the AFL became thickly involved in the labor affairs of other nations. This not only violated another AFL principle—the autonomy of labor unions—but it paralleled the very practices of the Communists that the AFL daily condemned. Second, the activity was carried on without the knowledge or prior consent of most rank-and-file union members at home. Third, the AFL increasingly tied its overseas activities to United States Government agencies, including the CIA. None of these developments fitted well into the democratic tradition of American unionism.

Meanwhile, in the increasingly bitter atmosphere of the cold war, the CIO withdrew from the Communist-dominated WFTU and, along with the AFL, affiliated with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU). Among other things, the agreement between the AFL and the CIO on foreign policy helped to create the climate for their merger in 1955. Although many in the CIO had been disillusioned by their experience with the Communists in the WFTU, what happened in that situation was by no means inevitable. It was rather the outcome of a deteriorating relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. Nor did the result necessarily vindicate either the premises or the practices of AFL foreign policy. Even so, AFL leaders stepped up their activities after the merger, despite the formal liquidation of the Free Trade Committee. Lovestone and his assistants have continued to the present their private espionage efforts abroad and have remained firmly in control of the foreign apparatus of the AFL-CIO.

George Meany estimated in 1963 that 25 per cent of AFL-CIO income—"plus a great deal more from our various affiliates—goes into these international activities." But this statement does not suggest the very substantial income from another major source—the United States Government. It has been estimated at \$110 million.

AFL-CIO involvement with official international policy has been expanded also by the increase of government personnel working in the field of international labor relations. By 1965, sixty-five labor attachés were assigned to United States embassies, 125 part-time labor officers and miscellaneous labor personnel were attached to embassies and missions of the Agency for International Development (AID) overseas, and twenty-one persons were employed as full-time workers in the State Department and AID in Washington. Nearly all these employees were cleared for appointment by the AFL-CIO, their militant anti-Communist credentials being scrutinized with particular care.

The attitude of the men who make American labor's foreign policy has produced a continuing dispute between them and Socialist-oriented unions affiliated with the ICFETU. Many in the world labor body would like to see a relaxation of tensions between East and West and less AFL-CIO dominance of the organization. Meany, Lovestone and company decidedly oppose this view. It is this sort of issue that provides the base for argument, not Mr. Meany's alleged quarrel with ICFETU officials over administrative matters or his concern about the personal morals of some ICFETU staff members.

A similar division between the AFL-CIO and the unions of other countries has occurred in the ICFETU's Latin American affiliate, ORIT. The AFL's first sustained overseas involvement was in Latin America, and it is still the scene of some of its most extensive activity. This is most dramatically illustrated in the work of the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), now directed by William C. Doherty, Jr. (see "Labor Between Bread and Revolution" by Sidney Lens, *The Nation*, September 19, 1966). The AIFLD, with a budget running into the millions, maintains fourteen Latin American field offices and has trained more than 30,000 students in United States union policies, tactics and organizational procedures. Nearly 500 of these students have taken advanced courses in Washington, have been placed on the AIFLD's payroll for nine months after they returned home, and have engaged in political activities in their countries, designed to advance the interests of the AFL-CIO and the United States Government.

The objectives of the AIFLD training schools have been primarily political. Paul K. Reed, former international representative of the United Mine Workers, made this clear in an exchange with the employer of one trade unionist from Bogotá, Colombia. Requesting a year's leave for this man, a union official, in order that he might participate in the AIFLD educational program. Reed declared that "we feel strongly that through the education of the workers it will be possible to halt the wave of communism sweeping through Latin America."

What this means in practice has become all too clear. In British Guiana, the AFL, along with large American corporations, supported the successful opponents of the Cheddi Jagan leftist regime, and in Brazil the AIFLD has cooperated with the military dictatorship of Humberto Castelo Branco. Only recently, Doherty endorsed Castelo Branco during public ceremonies dedicating a housing project largely financed by AID. In the Dominican Republic, federation-supported right-wing laborites helped in 1963 to oust Juan Bosch. The American union activity was so heavy-handed that eventually the Dominicans demanded that Fred Somersford, United States labor attaché, and Andrew McLellan, the ORIT representative, leave the country. Nevertheless, the AFL-CIO strenuously opposed Bosch in the 1966 elections, following American military intervention. It accused Bosch's revolutionary party (PRD), on very little evidence, of being Communist dominated, and leveled the same charge at unions supporting him.

The AIFLD has been a chief supporting instrument of these and other AFL-CIO activities in Latin America. It has also carried on what it calls "social projects," a series of efforts largely financed by the U.S. Government through AID. These include housing developments, worker co-ops, credit unions, banks, apprentice schools, medical clinics and union halls. Many of them are impressive achievements, but all have been channeled to the "proper" political recipients and favored unionists. The money, thus, has been political money, dispensed in accordance with AFL-CIO political objectives.

In these ambitious undertakings, the AIFLD has enjoyed not only the active participation and cooperation of the U.S. Government but also the support of certain private U.S. firms which have seen a controlled, antiradical union movement as necessary to their well-being. The board of trustees of the AIFLD includes J. Peter Grace of W. R. Grace and Company, Berent Friele of the Rockefeller Foundation, Charles Brinckerhoff, president of the Anaconda Company, and Juan Trippe, president of Pan American Airways.

AFL-CIO ventures in the area have, of course, been severely denounced by Latin American Communists and some Socialists. But the opposition has not come

only from the traditional Left. Supporters of former President Juan Perón of Argentina have been sharply critical and so has a group of labor organizations gathered in a growing organization known as the Latin American Confederation of Christian Trade Unions (CLASC), with its center of operations at Santiago de Chile. CLASC is affiliated with the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions (IFCTU), with European chapters in France, Belgium, Germany, Italy and Holland.

Though still small in numbers (about 50,000 dues-paying members), CLASC is a vigorous competitor of ORIT and a militant opponent of U.S. union activity and what it terms American "imperialism" in Latin America. But CLASC is also strongly anti-Communist and seems to borrow much of its central ideology and appeal from Peronista rhetoric. The emphasis is upon neutralism in the cold war and a revolutionary social program in Latin America. CLASC has been able to cause difficulties for Alliance for Progress trade union operations and thus to force U.S. officials to consider giving it a role in planning Alliance labor policies. This distresses the AFL-CIO, which has charged that CLASC "has traditionally opposed the U.S. type of economic system, has been anti-Alliance for Progress, Anti-Organization of American States and anti-Pan Americanism."

However, not all the AFL-CIO leadership shares that estimate. Among those who take an apparently more open-minded view are Walter Reuther and Victor Reuther. Indeed, the Reuther brothers and their friends have increasingly objected to the entire Meany-Lovestone foreign policy. This schism has long been suspected, but recently there have been sharp public exchanges between the two groups over such matters as labor's relationship with the State Department and the CIA, the AFL-CIO boycott of the ILO after a Polish delegate was elected president, the role of the AFL-CIO in the Dominican crisis, the federation's position on Vietnam, and its foreign policy theories and tactics in general.

The latest meeting of the executive council on November 14 confirmed AFL control of organized labor's foreign policy. Walter Reuther, for reasons which are not yet entirely clear, chose not to attend the council meeting, which endorsed the entire eleven-year foreign policy record of the merged federation. *The New York Times* reported that when Mr. Meany was asked whether this meant that the council felt it had made no mistakes whatsoever during this period, he replied: "Yep"—a response which may be taken to indicate that the Meany-Lovestone outlook has become more rigid than ever.

By openly disputing the position of Meany and Lovestone, Walter Reuther has probably risked his chances to succeed Meany as AFL-CIO president, but perhaps he has also set up the nucleus of a leadership able to challenge the established foreign policy of organized labor. He may elect to do this by dissociating the United Auto Workers from the foreign policy of the national labor federation, and by adopting an independent stand. It has been suggested that Reuther's absence from the November 14 meeting of the council was a first step in that direction. Whatever the strategy, Reuther could possibly provide a different direction for labor's international activities and also restore a portion of a badly damaged democratic labor tradition.

The alternative that Reuther represents is urgent for another and perhaps still more important reason. The present foreign policy of the federation contributes to an increased cold-war military build-up in the United States, because it emphasizes military responses to situations abroad. From Vietnam to the Dominican Republic, the AFL-CIO has endorsed the use of armed force. In so doing, American labor places its own hopes for domestic economic and social advance in severe jeopardy.

Contrary to official proclamations from Washington, the U.S. cannot have its guns and butter too. Already the Great Society programs have been slashed. That fact should be emphasized now, before anyone rushes to the defense of the Administration by ascribing those cuts to a future political consequence of Republican election successes. The cutbacks began long before last November and are mostly the result of the stepped-up war in Vietnam.

In the long run, American labor does not benefit from this situation, even if some workers in defense-oriented industries are temporarily the richer. The war boom must finally end, but it may not do so before conditions are created which deprive workers of important social programs, results in a postwar depression, or continue the military build-up to logical and totally disastrous consequences.

So, in the end, foreign policy and domestic politics are closely allied, and the AFL-CIO cannot pretend otherwise without injury to itself. From every point of view, therefore, it becomes a concrete and moral imperative for American labor to revise its assumptions about the role and goals of American labor abroad.

[From The Nation, Sept. 19, 1966]

LATIN AMERICA IV—LABOR BETWEEN BREAD AND REVOLUTION

(By Sidney Lens)

(As a writer for many publications and newspapers Mr. Lens has visited eighty-one countries. His most recent book is *Radicalism in America*, published last May by Thomas Y. Crowell.)

The problem confronting Latin America labor can be defined in one estimate and one fact. The *estimate* is that by the year 2000 the population of this area will be 600 million, two and a half times the present figure. The *fact* is that the grain situation is today drastically worse than it was in the 1930s. Thirty years ago, the twenty nations of Latin America exported more grain than any other area in the world; today they are net importers and their per capital output has declined by 16 per cent.

Therefore, no matter how quiescent the area may appear to be from time to time, explosions are inevitable; artful maneuvers and military suppression can cap the pressure just so long. Thus the decision confronting each Latin American union is how much energy it should apply to bread-and-butter issues and how much to social revolution. If the workers concentrate primarily on winning higher wages and allied benefits, will they eventually whittle the power of the oligarchies and achieve an adequate way of life; or, while continuing to fight for wage gains, must they determine to destroy the oligarchic structure itself?

Favoring the first course are those unions comprising ORIT (Inter-American Regional Labor Organization) which are linked to and guided by the AFL-CIO. Favoring the second course are the Communist unions, and more recently the nationalist, neutralist organizations grouped in CLASC (Latin American Confederation of Christian Trade Unions). The story of labor in this area is told in the churning conflict of these strategies.

There are 90 million to 95 million urban and rural toilers in the nineteen republics south of the Rio Grande (leaving out Cuba), of whom 15 per cent or 13 million carry union cards. The proportion varies widely from country to country. In Bolivia, where a social revolution took place in 1952, almost the whole working class is organized. In Paraguay, Brazil, Ecuador, Haiti and most of the Central American nations, the ratio is under 5 per cent or 10 per cent, and most of these are only nominal unionists, since they cannot engage in strikes or true collective bargaining. In Peru, 400,000 are organized out of a labor force of 5 million, and in Chile, where labor does have a degree of power, only 10 per cent of a potential 2.5 million are enrolled. Argentina, whose unions were built artificially by Peron, has a considerable movement. So does Mexico, which still benefits from the legacy of Cárdenas in the 1930s.

But size is of secondary significance, for power rests not in picket-line effectiveness or real bargaining but in politics. One can say that unions exist in Haiti, Nicaragua, Brazil, Honduras or Paraguay, but in fact they are impotent under the prevailing dictatorial governments. After the overthrow of Jacob Arbenz, Guatemalan unions went a decade without a single general wage increase. The unions in Brazil, despite glowing reports by the AFL-CIO, were emasculated by the military *coup d'état* of two years ago, when hundreds of unions were placed under trusteeship by Castelo Branco in order to remove the influence of former President Goulart and the Communists. The same thing happened in Ecuador during the military regime that was recently overthrown.

The Confederation of Mexican Workers (CTM) claims 1.25 million members and functions in a more stable milieu that may be called—stretching things a bit—a “democracy,” but it is not really an independent organization. As part of the ruling party (PRI), which has been assured of electoral victory for more than three decades, CTM controls labor rather than represents it. Its leaders are in the legislature or in fat government jobs, and though they do win some gains for the workingman, they are far more servile to the government than the union leaders to whom we are accustomed. What there is of an independent force in Mexico functions outside the CTM framework and is small and fragmented.

The situation in Venezuela is somewhat more fluid, but there too the movement relies heavily on the approval of the reigning party. More closely approximating the trade unions we know are the labor organizations of Chile and Uruguay, where there is political democracy, and those of Argentina which Peron shrewdly fostered as a counterforce to his political enemies.

It is thus exceedingly difficult to generalize about Latin American labor—as one might, for instance, about British or German labor. What traits they have in common are negative. Almost without exception, they are weak in the rural areas where a majority of the laborers and *campesinos* desperately need organization. They struggle defensively to preserve what they have, rather than take the offensive to improve standards. Brazilian labor, for instance, confronted with inflation of 40 per cent to 80 per cent a year, fights constantly to keep wages abreast of prices.

Collective bargaining is limited. Argentine labor has won nation-wide agreements that deal not only with wages but with grievance machinery and similar facets of traditional unionism. Similar agreements exist in Mexico and to a limited extent in Chile, where national bargaining has been in operation with the copper companies since 1956. But most Latin American legislatures have passed labor codes that restrict collective bargaining. These deal with minimum wages (which all too often become *maximum* wages for the majority), overtime, housing, union security and such items as "seven days' pay for six days' work" which was enacted some years ago in Chile. In Brazil, where the labor law of the old Vargas regime has never been formally dismantled, there is some collective bargaining in the big cities, but many of the wage rates are set by labor courts rather than in free talks between labor and management.

The overriding fact about Latin American unions is that they are shaped more by the fortunes of politics than by their own economic action. Each change of government means a change in the leadership, character and strategy of the labor federations. When dictator Odría left the Presidency of Peru in 1956, union leaders were released from jail and the movement was able to hold its first convention in a decade. Conversely, when General Aramburu took the helm in Argentina he appointed overseers, at first mostly military men, to run the unions. When constitutionalist soldiers took to the barricades in the Dominican Republic on April 24-28, 1965, in an effort to restore democratic government, they were joined by leaders and rank and file, both of the Bosch unions and, above all, of the Left-Catholic CLASC. The U.S.-dominated CONATRAL, on the other hand, stood sullenly on the sidelines and later refused to participate in the general strike protesting military brutality. Each group was seeking a government under which it could function best—or function at all.

The story of Latin American labor must therefore be written in a political perspective. It is not so much what unionists have already accomplished—admittedly, that is all too little—but what they hope to do in the future, and how they hope to do it. In terms of the area as a whole, there are the three distinct tendencies mentioned briefly at the beginning of the survey: the pro-American and violently anti-Communist ORIT, the nationalist, neutralist Christian federation, CLASC, and the Communist groupings, both pro-Moscow and pro-China.

ORIT claims 28 million members, half of whom are in the AFL-CIO. It is affiliated with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, but because it is so inextricably bound into the George Meany machine of the AFL-CIO (with Jay Lovestone guiding the international strategy), it is, like its mentors, often at odds with the international body. At a young workers' seminar in Mexico last October, European union leaders burst out in protest when ORIT's general secretary, Arturo Jauregui, introduced a Cuban speaker who had been a government minister under Batista. In the strategy of ORIT and the AFL-CIO the focal point of union behavior is anti-communism.

There is also some uneasiness, both in Europe and in the Walter Reuther wing of the AFL-CIO, because ORIT collaborates so closely with the U.S. State Department. The American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), established by the AFL-CIO and American business leaders, is financed to the extent of tens of millions of dollars by Washington's AID. Its money is spent on social programs and education to buttress "anti-Communist" unions friendly to ORIT, and personnel sometimes moves back and forth between ORIT and AIFLD. Morris Paladino, for instance, became assistant administrator for AIFLD after serving as assistant secretary for ORIT. In the minds of many labor leaders there is no difference between ORIT, Jay Lovestone and the U.S. labor attachés in the embassies of South America.

This does not mean that all the affiliates of ORIT are in Lovestone's pocket. Many of the metal worker's unions are closer to Walter Reuther than to the Meany-Lovestone entourage. The Venezuelan unions refused to endorse ORIT's desolution on the Dominican Republic. Last May, Mexico's CTM issued a statement decrying aid from AIFLD and seeking to dissociate itself from "foreign" interference.

Despite such scattered signs of independence, however, the thrust of the ORIT-AIFLD-Lovestone combine is toward simple unionism on the one hand, and anti-Communist politics on the other. Again and again, this force calls on its people to be "apolitical," which means in effect to support the U.S. *status quo*. The Alliance for Progress is endorsed with little criticism. Every victory "against communism" is hailed as if it were the millennium, and every "Communist," "neo-Communists," and neutralist success is described in shrill headlines, "Communist Capture Labor Arm of Juan Bosch's Dominican Party," is the main headline of the February, 1966, *Inter-American Labor Bulletin*, the monthly publication of ORIT. The May issue announces in strident tones that Uruguay's central labor federation, 220,000 strong, has been captured by the Communists, but reminds its readers that there are still fifty "free" unions with 64,000 members.

In the same issue, William C. Doherty, Jr., AIFLD administrator, offers the opinion, in which ORIT evidently concurs, that had the "revolution" (that is, the military coup) of March 31, 1964, not occurred in Brazil, the "free" labor movement there would have been dominated by the Communists. To counteract the Havana tri-continental Congress held earlier this year, ORIT called a special conference in Miami at which all and sundry were urged to "face up to the emergency affecting the American continent, in view of the new threat posed by Castro's totalitarianism."

A "political fever chart" in the February, 1966, issue of ORIT's paper lists "Communist terrorist activity" in Bolivia, Columbia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and Venezuela. It also lists countries where there are "labor unrest," "repression of free labor," "threat of military coups," and notes three others that are under "threat of leftist take-over." Reading the *Inter-American Labor Bulletin*, it would be easy to assume that Latin American labor's most urgent task is to repel a Communist seizure of the whole area. There seems to be no menace from any other quarter; oligarchy, military or U.S. domination. The paper offers almost no information about genuine labor struggles such as strikes—perhaps because there are so few.

ORIT schools conducted along these negative anti-Communist lines have trained 30,000 unionists since 1960, and AIFLD has added tens of thousands more—including 400 or 500 brought to Washington for advanced courses. Three thousand Brazilians had been "educated" by AIFLD as of the end of 1965. Carefully discouraged are such militant elements as those among the Bolivian miners, some of whom are Communist and Trotskyites:

On the economic front ORIT seeks to confine activity to simple union objectives such as wages, hours and grievance machinery—a carbon copy of North American union objectives. But since the right to strike is severely curtailed in so many Latin American countries, and bargaining must take place under the watchful eye of the Minister of Labor, this not too impressive an activity. There is no question that the AFL-CIO wants its ORIT affiliates to gain higher wages and shorter hours, and is willing to spend money for that purpose. But present conditions in Latin America do not lend themselves to any massive campaign in that direction, and the result—as Joseph J. Palisl, a former staffer of AIFLD points out—is that ORIT "has tended to serve the needs of worker 'aristocracy' within Latin American labor." Understandably, it also has a "weak 'revolutionary' image," which under present circumstances "is an important deficiency."

The Communist-led unions, of course, search for a more militant role in economic affairs and stand—at least abstractly—for a revolutionary reconstruction of society. In Chile and Uruguay, Communist leadership is predominant. In Argentina and Bolivia, though excluded from top leadership in the unions, the Communists are a formidable bloc. But communism is no longer as formidable as in the days when the Mexican Lombardo Toledano, head of the Confederación de Trabajadores de América Line (CTAL). Lombardo has become more moderate, and many of the pro-Communist affiliates have either changed leadership or lost interest. CTAL has been in limbo for almost a decade and a half. After Castro merged with the Communists he sought to rebuild a leftist international federation, together with unions in Venezuela, Bolivia and the Peronista faction in Argentina, but the effort was abortive.

Today, communism is fragmented. The pro-Chinese elements prefer to spend their energies organizing in the rural areas, and the pro-Moscow and pro-Fidel segments have lost much of their aggressiveness. The pro-Moscow wing, in particular, is weakened by the fact that some of its comrades served in dictatorial governments such as those of Batista. For the most part it, like ORIT, lacks the "revolutionary" image (see "Revolution Without Revolutionaries" by Norman Gall, *The Nation*, August 22).

The new force that seems to be on the upgrade in Latin America is CLASC, which has international headquarters in Santiago de Chile. Formed a decade ago and still the smallest of the three forces in Latin American labor, CLASC seems certain to become a formidable challenge to ORIT and the AFL-CIO, even though it is excoriated by some right-wing priests as too radical, and two or three Christian union centers have as yet refused to join it. Its affiliate in Chile enjoys the friendship of President Eduardo Frei, and in the Dominican Republic it has recruited 60 per cent of the currently organized unionists. Like ORIT, CLASC gets outside financial help (though it is very little by comparison). The money comes from the Christian Democrats of West Germany and the international Christian union body.

More significant than its size is the fact that CLASC enters the arena as a revolutionary force which is neutralist, and offers a "third way" that is neither pro-Communist nor pro-American. It insists that Latin American unions coordinate their economic activity with the movement for fundamental social change. For this it has won the unyielding hostility of the AFL-CIO's Lovestone group and ORIT.

"Influenced by United States labor leaders," says Emilio Maspero, CLASC's secretary-general, "various Latin American trade unions appear to operate on the belief that by negotiating collectively agreed upon contracts . . . they can achieve a higher standard of living for the laboring masses and effect meaningful reform. There is no basis in reality to justify this assumption. The only feasible goal for labor in Latin America is to organize the working forces in a decisive manner as an instrument for affecting social revolution."

Maspero derides both U.S. unionists who preach "the advantages of free enterprise and popular capitalism" and the Communists who "have always preferred to penetrate, infiltrate and dominate the existing trade unions." (CLASC, however, has warmer feelings toward Walter Reuther and his brother Victor.) Maspero, heading an organization of only a few million members, points out that "there are more than 80 million peasants and workers who are not organized," and makes it clear to ORIT that he does not intend to "steal" their members, but to organize that 80 million. Whether he and his associates can do it remains to be seen, but there is no doubt that they offer an attractive nationalist and neutralist alternative to the two forces that have hitherto been in the saddle. By condemning U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic, U.S. control of the Organization of American States, and its support of militarist regimes, CLASC is creating a strong undergirding of popular support. If it can make headways in the rural areas, currently its first priority, it will become formidable.

An intelligent United States policy would embrace this "third force." It is the only one that offers any hope because, whatever its weaknesses, it at least points the way to what Latin America—with its ballooning population and its relative decline in food production—desperately needs. If this opportunity is thrust aside (as France and the United States spurned a similar one in Vietnam) the people of the nineteen republics will have little choice but to align themselves with Peking-minded guerrilla movements.

Here, alas, the AFL-CIO and the State Department have been until now mad-deningly shortsighted. They prefer a futile crusade against communism to support of the nationalist-neutralist forces that offer Latin American toilers an opening into the future.

[From *The Nation*, July 5, 1965]

AMERICAN LABOR ABROAD—LOVESTONE DIPLOMACY

(By Sidney Lens)

In a fourth-floor office of the AFL-CIO's "marble palace," just across from the White House, sits Jay Lovestone, once head of the American Communist Party, but for the past quarter century as embittered an anti-Communist as you can find in the United States. From his bureau he directs an assortment of men who, at behest of George Meany, are fighting a world battle against communism. Harry Goldberg has been with Lovestone in and out of Communist bondage for decades, but gives the impression of wishing he were back to his old job of writing music criticism for *The New Leader*. Andrew McClellan, once an amateur bullfighter, is low keyed, easy to talk to; his anti-communism seems steadfast as the polestar. Ernest Lee, a former Marine major, is Meany's son-in-

law; Henry Rutz is a former Socialist from Milwaukee, and there are a few others of lesser consequence.

About a mile away, on K and 19th Streets, in the building which also houses Joseph Bierne's Communications Workers of America, is the office of the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), whose mission is to keep communism out of Latin America. Here sits Serafino Rumaldi, AIFLD's major-domo, a pleasant, round-faced man of retirement age, who hopes soon to be rewarded with the Ambassadorship to Costa Rica. A floor or two above him is the office of William C. Doherty, Jr., who runs the special projects department of AIFLD. He is the son of a former AFL-CIO vice president who later served as Ambassador to Jamaica. The younger Doherty, though technically under Rumaldi, runs his own show.

Finally, 250 miles away in New York are two offices—one on Second Avenue and another on East 46th Street—which are the stamping grounds of Irving Brown, next to Lovestone the most important member of this assemblage. Wherever there is a "Communist problem," there you are likely to see Irving Brown. On Second Avenue he is a representative of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU); on East 46th Street he is the executive director of a new outfit called the African-American Labor Center. Helping Brown, on a part-time basis in his ICFTU capacity, is Arnold Beichman, a capable writer and political theorist who contributes often to the New York *Herald Tribune* and *The Christian Science Monitor*.

These men—along with Meany, Beirne and David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union—are organized labor's cold warriors; for two decades they have been conducting what would be called "outside subversion" if the other side were doing it. They have in effect interfered in the internal affairs of sovereign states, without being accountable for their acts to Congress, the American people, or for that matter the American working class.

Traditionally, the labor movement has been expected to confine its activities on the international front to two pursuits: (1) To pressure its own government to adopt a foreign policy favorable to world labor; (2) to prevent international strikebreaking, assist foreign unions in strikes and organizing efforts, and exchange information with labor organizations abroad.

But since the end of World War II, the Lovestone-Meany team has gone three steps beyond these limits:

(1) Except in a few instances where it disagreed with U.S. policy (usually because it was not "tough" enough on communism), it has acted virtually as an agent for the American Government on a broad basis.

(2) It has followed overseas a role so aggressive as to be a factor in the internal life of other nations.

(3) It has become involved, indirectly at least, in intelligence activities.

Equally disturbing in the Lovestone-Meany record has been its negative approach to world affairs. It is not that these men oppose communism, as most of us would, or even that they resist contact with Communist countries. It is rather that their basic strategy has been a schematic anti-communism in many instances indistinguishable from that of the far Right. They have pitted themselves, not merely against Communist organizations, but against many non-Communist groups which only in the lexicon of the rightists would be considered "soft on communism."

An amusing incident last March focused attention on the role of the AFL-CIO in foreign affairs, a subject seldom aired in public. It also indicated a certain tension in the alliance of union diplomats, George Meany, that "honest plumber" who heads the AFL-CIO, denounced the 130-man staff of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions as an "ineffective bureaucracy right down to the fairies."

After the titters had died down, Meany explained that he was referring only to the "gossips and so on you find in any bureaucracy." He wasn't impugning anyone's virility, just their effectiveness. The ICFTU machine was "a complete and absolute bureaucracy" which engaged in practices that were "unethical if not worse." However, in the labor movements of industrial Western Europe the matter was not dismissed so lightly. *Arbetet*, a Socialist paper in Sweden, published an article: "Double-Dealing in the Trade Union International/Trade Union Boss in USA Crushes Aid Fund." It found Meany's claim that there was something wrong with the fund "peculiar" because he is "the Chairman of the Board of the Solidarity Fund. It is he who leads the work, and as a Chairman rules the decisions which the fund makes."

Other non-Communist unionists abroad also found Meany's behavior "peculiar," but no one seems eager to probe further. American critics of Meany's foreign policy, like Walter and Victor Reuther, or James B. Carey, or Ralph Helstein of the United Packinghouse union, keep their dissent to themselves. But in the corridors of the trade union movement, here and abroad, one hears ominous rumors about secret activity and links to intelligence services, about collaboration with government that far exceeds union duty, about a policy that clings to the extreme Right.

One hardly expects a moderate labor movement like the AFL-CIO to swing wide from the trail marked out by the State Department, and pursue its own course to end the arms race. But neither does one expect that it will be an active ally of the most belligerent elements in our State Department. Nor is one prepared to find that the AFL-CIO has a sizable, world-embracing apparatus and spends millions of government funds for its work.

What the U.S. Government does not do directly, because it would be flagrant meddling with the internal affairs of other nations, and what the CIA cannot do because it is suspect, the AFL-CIO does on their behalf. In ostensibly innocent relationships between unions of one country with another, the AFL-CIO throws its weight toward the making and unmaking of governments, with the purpose of instilling abroad the phobic anti-communism that has become entrenched at home. Jay Lovestone holds no public office, but it would be naive to deny that he influences national policy.

Edwin Lahey, Washington correspondent for the Knight newspapers, once described Lovestone as "a real mystery man, whose personality is part cloak and dagger, part cloak and suit." (Lovestone was then working out of the Ladies' Garment Workers' Union headquarters.) Lahey noted that "Lovestone insists rather sheepishly that there is no formal connection between him and the Central Intelligence Agency, nor between him and the Department of State, [but] it can be stated without qualification that the CIA . . . has in recent years obtained much of its primary information about international communism from Lovestone." A Chicago *Tribune* dispatch of December 17, 1954, said that "Lovestone readily agreed that his AFL Free Trade Union Committee is engaged in intelligence work." A laudatory *Reader's Digest* article on Irving Brown by a former AFL staffer, Donald Robinson, reports that Hans Jahn, head of the German rail union "told me about an undercover organization he has set up. . . . Irving Brown helped us. . . . Much of what he [Brown] has done in the cloak-and-dagger realm cannot be recounted. It would endanger the lives of his associates and jeopardize their missions."

When AIFLD was formed in 1962, three or four men were considered for the top post before it was given to Romualdi. Two of them, whom I have known for many years, told me that they veered away from the job when they heard background whispers of a certain Michigan Fund. The Michigan Fund is one of eight foundations which, according to Rep. Wright Patman, funneled almost \$1 million to the J. M. Kaplan Fund of New York from 1961 to 1963. And the Kaplan Fund was in turn, says Representative Patman, a "secret conduit" for the Central Intelligence Agency. The Michigan Fund has an address but no telephone listing. One year, before it got Internal Revenue permission to withhold operating data, it listed total annual expenses of \$60.51. One of the candidates for the AIFLD job, on being told that the Michigan Fund would "give us lots of money," was venturesome enough to check it out at the Internal Revenue Service. When he found no record of it, he removed himself from competition.

Wherever one turns in this area of international union activity there are overtones of secret funds and secret intelligence. *The New York Times* of October 5, 1947, reported the formation of an organization called the Free Trade Union Center in Exile. It has offices in Paris with the *Force Ouvrière*, which has received packets of money from Irving Brown. According to the *Times*, it also "appears to have at its disposal a working intelligence division."

After the 1963 general strike in British Guiana—which Drew Pearson claims was "inspired by a combination of C.I.A. money and British Intelligence"—Prime Minister Cheddi Jagan charged that \$1.2 million had been made available to his enemies from American sources. His figure may be high, but with 20,000 to 25,000 laborers on strike for eleven and a half weeks it would come to only \$45 or \$60 each. When I was in British Guiana in August, 1963, a union official named Pollidor informed me that the strikers had received \$3 a week in food benefits for the whole eleven-and-a-half-week period. That adds up to something between \$700,000 and \$850,000. Andrew McClellan, who handles inter-

American affairs for the AFL-CIO and was in and out of Georgetown during the walkout, told me that he didn't know exactly how much had been contributed by American labor. He personally could recall about \$50,000, but perhaps there was more. Even so, a sizable gap remains between the figures of Pollidor and Jagan and those of McClellan. Who contributed the balance? If it was AFL-CIO money, why hasn't there been an accounting, particularly since U.S. labor's role in British Guiana has been criticized both here and in England? If it was CIA money, who was the go-between?

The roster of American unionists who were in Georgetown before, during and after the strike is formidable, considering that the country has a population of only 600,000. Among the visitors were McClellan, William Doherty, Jr., and Ernest Lee of the top echelon; William McCabe, a special AFL-CIO representative; Gene Meakins, of the Newspaper Guild; two Retail Clerks union officials; Pat Terrill of the Steelworkers; Ben Segal of the Electrical Workers; and four or five others, as well as a couple of Latin Americans. McCabe, it is said, was present the whole time. Some of the unionists, Segal, for example, had long associations with the Guianese, but others were new to the country. Gerard P. O'Keefe of the Retail Clerks told me that he was supposed to help draft a labor bill in opposition to the one proposed by Jagan. Meakins was doing "public relations" work for the Man Power Citizens Association (MPCA), the union for whose allegiance the two major political parties were fighting. No economic issues were in dispute; the strike was called in protest against Jagan's labor bill, modeled on the U.S. Wagner Act, and designed to give the 20,000 MPCA workers a chance to vote for union representation. (MPCA leader, Richard Ishmael, was so unpopular, according to Segal, that mention of his name at a union meeting was the signal for a round of boos.) Why were American union men involved in a political dispute, in a foreign country? Did they collaborate with the U.S. Government?

The links between the State Department and Meany's international missionaries are indisputable. The AFL-CIO has its own liaison man in the Department; he is George P. (Phil) Delaney, who serves as Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for International Labor Affairs. It is almost impossible for any labor attaché to be appointed to a diplomatic post if Meany and Lovestone advise Delaney that he does not please them. A man who sought a labor position with the Agency for International Development (AID) told me that his application was held up because Meany had reservations about his anti-communism. He was advised by his sponsors to seek a letter of recommendation from Dubinsky to overcome Meany's suspicions. Another such man, whose record was less controversial, told me that he submitted to a lengthy interview with Lovestone before being given the green light.

The implacability with which the AFL-CIO opposes communism on the international front makes it regard every thaw in the struggle with Moscow and Peking as a trick, and every step toward coexistence a disaster. Recently, when both the government and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce proposed increasing trade with the Soviet Union, Meany and his friends condemned it on the ground that it would "only finance and facilitate further Soviet aggression against the democracies." On this, as on other subjects, the labor leaders are often to the right of big business. When Secretary-General U Thant hailed changes in Russia which might result in "competitive coexistence," Lovestone pounced on him in a long article which recounted all the old Stalinist crimes and asserted that Khrushchev had never repudiated "his predecessor's foreign policy."

Lovestone and Meany's extra-union associations reflect these same views. Lovestone is a charter member of the Committee of One Million, formed to keep China out of the UN, and was involved with the Council against Communist Aggression, a China Lobby front. He appears, along with Admiral Arleigh A. Burke (Ret.) and Edward Teller, on the letterhead of the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba. In December, 1959, Meany and Lovestone were given the Grand Cross, Second Class, by Konrad Adenauer. They were also honored last year by the Assembly for Captive European Nations, a group of conservative Socialist and peasant party leaders from nine East European countries, who receive their money from the Radio Free Europe Fund.

In the world view of Meany and his subalterns the cold war is permanent until one side or the other is beaten. Russian peace proposals should thus be scorned as frauds. "Throughout its history," says a 1964 AFL-CIO Executive Council statement, "the Soviet government has launched 'peace offensives' whenever it deemed it necessary to have a breathing spell for overcoming difficulties

or a pause during which to consolidate its international position and dull the vigilance of the forces opposing it." The Geneva Conference of a decade ago was a terrible thing for, as Irving Brown told the Chicago Council of Foreign Relations, it "was the beginning of the attainment of one of Russia's long-sought objectives—the banning of nuclear warfare." At a press conference in Tokyo recently, Lovestone stated flatly that George F. Kennan's proposal for reducing tensions "was wrong," and Sen. William Fulbright was ignorant of the true facts of the "Communist conspiracy" when he made similar suggestions.

Do these fellows ever do anything but grit their teeth? The Russians completely control the Chinese," Lovestone told a *New York Post* man in December, 1955. In July, 1949, just two months before Mao set up his government, Lovestone's Free Trade Union Committee was advising Washington: "We categorically repudiate the notion that all is hopelessly lost." Two years later, Brown, speaking at a Radio Free Europe ceremony, predicted, in the words of *The New York Times*, "that the dictatorship and armies of Premier Stalin would not long endure." Such analysis and prognostication can come only from a lopsided view of the world.

The Meanyites' actions are tailored to their humorless words. They can claim credit since 1945 for:

- (1) Helping to split the French and Italian labor movements.
- (2) Encouraging the emergence of conservative leaders in many German unions, and keeping them on the narrow cold-war path.
- (3) Involving themselves—some of them, not all—in the gathering of hard intelligence which has nothing to do with legitimate trade union work.
- (4) Subsidizing questionable elements in Marseilles and other European ports to break dock workers' boycotts of American arms shipments.
- (5) Giving support to unionists in British Guiana in an effort to depose the elected Jagan government.
- (6) Endorsing right-of-center laborites in the Dominican Republic who were dissatisfied with Juan Bosch and played a role in his ouster.
- (7) Training Brazilians who joined the generals in jettisoning the constitutional regime of Goulart.
- (8) Infiltrating American embassies with many labor attachés who share their views and put them into practice.
- (9) Defending every military intervention by the United States including, most recently, Cuba, Vietnam, the Congo and the Dominican Republic; and condemning nationalist forces, such as those in Panama, who oppose U.S. policy.
- (10) "Educating" literally tens of thousands of unionists in the Lovestone band of anti-communism and setting them loose, with money and inspiration, against unions with left-of-center leadership.

It would be wrong to say that the Lovestone activity has been all of one piece. Irving Brown gave considerable aid to unionists in North Africa who were fighting French imperialism. He also supported Lumumba, until his death. The AFL-CIO as such has denounced Fascist Spain, apartheidist South Africa, and the military dictatorships of Paraguay and Haiti. But its anticolonialism and anti-racism are usually subordinate to its anti-communism. An AFL-CIO executive council statement in 1959 proclaimed that "the longer colonialism lasts, the greater is the danger of Communist penetration." It is significant that it has never condemned neo-colonialism by the United States in Latin America. The AFL-CIO would prefer, Brown and Beichman told me, to build genuine mass movements—unions, student groups, women's councils, peasant organizations—as the best counterweight to communism. However, if that fails, they stand four-square with military intervention and *coups d'état* to subdue not only Communists but nationalists who might "open the door" to Communists.

How did the AFL-CIO, which is usually on the side of freedom and progress in domestic affairs, fall into such a quagmire on the international front?

The tale begins with two AFL leaders of divergent purpose, David Dubinsky, president of the Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, and the late Matthew Woll of the Photo-Engravers' Union. Dubinsky, a colorful ex-dress cutter who was once a Socialist, hated the Communists, partly from principle and partly because of an internecine war in his own union. Woll, on the other hand, was to the end of his days an arch conservative, violently anti-Communist, not because he believed in socialism, but because he was labor's fiercest champion of capitalism. At one time he was acting president of the National Civic Federation, an organization of employers and right-wing unionists initiated by Mark Hanna

and supplied with money by the Morgans and August Belmont. He was also head of the Union Labor Life Insurance Company. Unlike Dubinsky, his interest in foreign affairs was pragmatic rather than ideological. If you were going to beat the Communists you had to fight them on their own terms, world-wide.

Except for these two men, the AFL's interest in world affairs was remote before World War II. Even George Meany, still waiting to climb the ladder, was an onlooker. But with the outbreak of war there arose an obvious need for international activity, if only to aid the many unionists in Germany, Italy and Vichy France who had gone underground and needed help just to stay alive. In 1940, Dubinsky and Woll formed the Labor League for Human Rights "for war relief purposes and for the support of labor causes everywhere." In 1941, Dubinsky's New York locals agreed to raise \$300,000 to help rescue labor leaders from the Nazis. With one eye cocked on the Communist problem, the two men nonetheless did invaluable humanitarian work. But as the war approached its end the Dubinsky-Woll team again became concerned with the menace of communism. In 1944, together with the late William Green, then president of the A. F. of L. and George Meany, they established the Free Trade Union Committee (FTUC) to revive the free union movement in Europe and Japan, and "to help such unions . . . resist the new drives of totalitarian [i.e., Communist] forces." For executive secretary they chose Jay Lovestone.

Then in his mid-forties and a vigorous man, Lovestone had been one of the founders of the Communist Party after World War I; he was its general secretary in 1929 when Moscow ordered him expelled. Lovestone had been unfortunate enough, in the three-way race among Stalin, Trotsky and Bukharin, to place his bets on Bukharin. Though ousted from power, he was not fully disenchanted for another decade. First he formed the Communist Party (Opposition), whose purpose—aside from polemics and normal union activity—was to seek readmission to the official movement. In mid-1933, he re-emphasized his "fundamental objective . . . to unite and rehabilitate the Communist movement in America. . . ." Years later he protested, in a letter to Hearst columnist George E. Sokolsky, that "from the very moment that I broke with the Communist Party . . . I fought Soviet totalitarianism." But as late as 1935, he acrimoniously berated A. J. Muste, in a public debate, because the latter called Russia a "degenerated" rather than a *real* "worker's state." When some of his comrades suggested that his league give up its orientation on unity with Moscow, he fought a faction fight against them. Even the first Moscow trials did not disillusion him; it was only when his former friends among the Bukharinists, including Bukharin himself, stood in the dock that he denounced the trials.

During this unhappy decade Jay Lovestone enjoyed two spectacular successes in the trade union movement. One was in the auto union, where Lovestone became for a time the behind-the-scenes mentor for U.A.W. President Homer Martin and was able to place some of his members, including Irving Brown, in top posts. This base, however, proved tenuous when Martin lost office, and Lovestone won more durable success in the garment union. His followers helped Dubinsky to stabilize his hold on the union and to enlist new members. It was not unnatural, then, that when Lovestone dissolved his political organization in 1941, Dubinsky should offer him a job.

Lovestone was in many respects an ideal man for Dubinsky. He was one of the few people in the country who could talk the language of Marxism to European labor leaders. From previous associations, he knew many dissident Communists and Socialists on the Continent. Furthermore, he impressed not only Dubinsky but Woll, and above all George Meany, whose star was, beginning to rise. What Meany, as a good American and a good Irishman, felt viscerally—namely, anticommunism and anti-colonialism—Lovestone could put into elaborate left-wing political verbiage. Though Lovestone did not hold any post in the AFL's own international affairs committee (this was variously headed by Robert Watt, Frank Fenton and Phil Delaney) his special status with the men of power gave him control of actual operations. Thus, out of an unlikely alliance of two ex-radicals and two ongoing conservatives, whose way was made easier by William Green's lack of interest in foreign affairs, was born the AFL-CIO's anti-Communist crusade.

Before long, old and new Lovestone recruits, some on the Free Trade Union Committee payroll, others on that of the AFL itself, began to appear in the international labor movement. Henry Rutz went to Germany; Richard Deverall, former executive secretary of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists (ACTU), to Japan and other Asian outposts; Harry Goldberg to Indonesia, later to Italy.

The team also included Mrs. Page Morris, and Arab-Moslem expert who was once an assistant to William Donovan of the OSS, Maida Springer, Ely Borochowitz, Carmel Offi, as well as a number of American labor attachés and local men in India, Israel and elsewhere. Romualdi, who had worked for Dubinsky long before Lovestone, joined the force independently and carved out a niche as Latin American delegate.

The key figure of the operation was Irving Brown. Son of a Teamster, having worked his way through college, active in union and unemployed circles, he had been with Lovestone since the mid-thirties when he infiltrated a left-wing Socialist Party caucus on his behalf. After serving in a number of government posts during the war, he wound up as the AFL representative in Europe.

The Communists, having played so decisive a role in the European underground, inevitably assumed postwar leadership of many unions. They predominated in Italy and France, were influential in Greece, and had sizable forces elsewhere. In the first years of peace there was, furthermore, expansive hope for coexistence. British unions and the CIO joined hands with Soviet and Communist-dominated unions in the West to form the World Federation of Trade Unions (the AFL refused to join). The Communists, far from being obstreperous, were quite moderate. They agreed meekly, at Stalin's behest, to give up arms used in the resistance, and to yield factories which they had occupied afterward. They were so intent on rebuilding Europe's shattered economies that they impressed even Joseph Alsop, who attributed the reconstruction of France in great measure to "the enthusiastic collaboration of the French Communist Party."

Perhaps the cold war was inevitable and schism in the international labor forces predestined, but certainly American unionists should have tried to prevent it. That was not the view of Irving Brown and Jay Lovestone. Their first order of business was to prevent the Communists from entrenching themselves in Germany, and to split off the non-Communists in Italy and France. Their method of operation was prosaically simple. Europe was digging out from the shambles of war; everyone was hungry. Union leaders lacked food for their families; they lacked typewriters, mimeograph machines, newsprint, offices, for their unions. A man who could produce such items was months, perhaps a year or two, ahead of his rivals. Under "Operation Food" the AFL sent 5,000 packages to Germany, 15,000 to France, 2,000 to Austria, and 5,000 to Greece. And Brown chose the recipients.

How much was given out, to whom it went, how it was used, we may never know. Brown's German operation was not large, but he built up an anti-Communist cadre that settled itself into various unions. How simon-pure a cadre it was is suggested by a dispatch in *The New York Times* of October 26, 1948, which records that a delegation of German unionists, accompanied by Lovestone himself, visited the Secretary of the United States Army to offer "former German war pilots to fly the airlift into Berlin." Dubinsky may well have been right when he wrote in January, 1949, that "had it not been for the extensive educational activities of the Free Trade Union Committee of the AFL . . . the Communists . . . might by now have seized control of the reviving German trade unions." This might have been unfortunate, but it is odd that Dubinsky never asked himself whether the German workers had a right to make their own choice without "educational activities" from the outside. Had the help been given to *all* union leaders, or even to all non-Communist union leaders, it is possible that a different movement might have evolved.

In France, Brown prodded his contacts to split from the General Confederation of Labor (CGT) as quickly as possible, and to refuse any collaboration with the Communists in strikes. Beginning in May, 1947, a wave of walkouts took place for wage increases. A few business unionists and mild Socialists, spurred by Brown, argued that the strikes were both unnecessary and politically inspired. They withdrew from CGT and regrouped around a publication called *Force Ouvrière*. The aging Leon Jouhaux, leader of French labor for decades, opposed the premature split, insisting that it would be far better to remain within CGT, if only to win over a larger constituency. But he was outvoted by Brown's friends and dragged along in a rump group that was stillborn from its inception. *F. O.* was never strong except in a few white-collar unions, and is even less impressive today.

The most interesting drama of this period was Brown's support of a man named Pierre Ferri-Pisani. In 1949-50, Communist trade unionists were refusing to unload American arms at Marseilles and other ports. Whether they were right to do so is, of course, a matter of opinion, but it was certainly farfetched that an

American unionist should undertake the thwarting of workers in France. Apparently at Brown's instigation Ferri-Pisani formed the Mediterranean Committee, with funds that suddenly appeared for the purpose of getting the arms unloaded. The actions of the Mediterranean Committee were so flagrant that the Mayor of Marseilles, Gaston Defferre, wrote a letter to his Socialist Party chief, Guy Mollet, pleading with him to stop Brown and Ferri-Pisani's activities.

In France, Brown had helped so-called Socialist unions and had been lukewarm to the Christian CFDT, which was willing to form *ad hoc* alliances with the Communists to advance common objectives. In Italy, the position was reversed. Brown and Harry Goldberg were hostile both to Nenni's Socialists and to the right-wing Sarragat Socialists, who for tactical reasons did not want to break immediately with the Italian General Confederation of Labor (C.G.I.L.). Instead, the American supported the Christians in their secession from the main body of Italian labor.

In Greece, Brown built a little empire around Fotis Makris after the Communists had been purged from the unions through government pressure. This was to be an interesting (though incidental) chapter, for it showed to what lengths anti-communism could go. Makris was a loyal Brown man, and fairly solid with the regime. He had to be, because Greek law requires workers to pay a certain sum to the unions, the money being checked off from their wages, sent to the minister of labor, and then relayed—at the minister's whim—to the unions. But there came a time when even Makris could not tolerate government cuts in worker benefits. In the mid-1950s he decided to mount a legitimate campaign of limited strikes to culminate in broader national action. At this point Brown's pressure was enough to force Makris to yield. They quarreled and the American representative thereafter placed his support with another segment of the Greek movement organized around Dimitrios Theodoros of Salonika.

There is more to the record, but the story is the same. Right-wing columnist Westbrook Pegler says Lovestone spent "millions." Robert Lewin of the *Chicago Daily News* said, in 1950, that it was \$250,000 a year, and, "including special union gifts . . . \$5,000,000." Donald Robinson, whose praise for Brown is unqualified, said in 1952 that he had spent "close to \$1 million." When I interviewed Brown in 1965, he claimed that in twenty years he had donated about \$100,000 to foreign unions.

For his work abroad, U.S. Ambassador to France, James G. Dunn, hailed Brown as a "superb fighter for freedom." *Life* called him labor's "most effective ambassador." But throughout Europe, most non-Communist unionists look on Lovestone and Brown with hostility. "Many people say," wrote the official weekly of the Swedish Federation of Labor (L.O.) in 1955, "that Brown's maniac anti-Communist attitude is a valuable asset to communism. When it comes to a consistent and effective fight against the dictatorship ideology of communism, Irving Brown has nothing at all to teach—and everything to learn from others."

In December, 1955, when the A. F. of L. and CIO merged, there was hope that Lovestone's influence would finally be curbed. Walter Reuther and his brother Victor—for much the same reasons as the Swedish L.O.—disliked the Lovestone-Brown techniques. They felt that AFL-CIO activity should be subordinated to that of the international confederation in Brussels. They wanted Lovestone out of the picture and his Free Trade Union Committee liquidated. They did not like the constant quarreling between Meany and the ICFTU.

Unfortunately, what was expected to be a showdown turned out to be a whisper in the corridors. Meany continued to lean on Lovestone as his main foreign policy adviser. The FTUC was, indeed, scrapped, but Lovestone continued with his work of overseas manipulation, first as a member of the AFL-CIO's Department of International Affairs, and after 1963 as its director.

As a matter of fact the Lovestone-Meany alliance has become more aggressive in recent years. In particular, the quarrel with ICFTU officials in Brussels has become hotter. As *The New York Times* has said editorially, Meany's relations with ICFTU leaders "have rarely run smoothly for more than a year or two at a time. At least a half-dozen major reorganizations have been undertaken, largely to satisfy his complaints. . . ."

At root, however, is a fundamental dispute between the Socialist unionists of Europe, especially those of Great Britain and Scandinavia, who would like to see a relaxation of tensions, and Meany who wants to pursue the cold war to the bitter end. As a result, Meany is by-passing the world body and leaning on the U.S. Government more openly than ever in the past. Since the foundation of the American Institute for Free Labor Development in 1961, the Meanyites have more

and more embarked on a unilateral course, and the trend became even more pronounced a few months ago when Irving Brown formed the African-American Labor Center. There is no longer a question as to the source of money used by the AFL-CIO in its international work—the overwhelming bulk of it comes from government sources. Labor has had access to about \$110 million of public funds to further its anti-Communist purpose.

The newest chapter in the internal affairs of the AFL-CIO begins in 1959, and introduces another generation of anti-Communists. Late in that year, Joseph Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America (CWA), held a class for sixteen Latin American unionists at Front Royal, Va. Instead of financing the Front Royal conference through the union, Beirne conceived the novel idea of having the International Cooperation Administration, predecessor to AID, put up most of the funds. This gave Beirne enough money not only to educate Latin unionists but to pay their salaries for a period of nine months after they returned home. In that time, presumably, they were to put their training into practice. Apparently it never occurred to Beirne that legitimate Latin unionists, who have an ingrained hostility to "Yankee Imperialism," might find ICA money distasteful; for the kind of people he recruited it didn't seem to make much difference.

On the strength of the Virginia experience, Beirne suggested to Meany that the program be widened, and after a preliminary study AIFLD was founded. It first opened its doors to students in June of 1962. Inter-American union machinery for educating workers already existed. The Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers (ORIT) had been formed in 1951, and there were also eight or nine "trade secretariats"—international bodies of unions in the same industry, such as metal workers or culinary workers—to do the job. Beirne and Meany, however, wanted something more directly under their control.

As a trade union instrument—particularly one that must appeal to Latin Americans engaged in bitter struggles with their own oligarchies—AIFLD is a little bizarre. Its board of trustees includes not only union men but representatives of the very corporations with which Latin American unions must bargain. Meany is president. Chairman of the board, however, is J. Peter Grace of W. R. Grace & Co., which owns shipping companies, sugar haciendas, distilleries, box factories, light-bulb subsidiaries, textile plants and other enterprises in Latin America. It is a more enlightened firm than, say, United Fruit, but it does not burst with union fervor. Vice chairman of the board is Berent Friele, a Nelson Rockefeller man. Among the trustees are Charles Brinckerhoff, president of the Anaconda Company; Juan Trippe, president of Pan American World Airways; Henry S. Woodbridge of the Tru Temper Company; William M. Hickey of the United Corporation; and Ambassador Robert C. Hill of Merck & Company. These men do not run the show, but the association of their names with a "labor school" is not likely to draw a large student body from among those laborites in the Latin states who see the answer to their problems in social revolution.

Nor will the financing quiet suspicion. Official press releases and speeches by William Doherty, Jr., give the impression that government, business and labor each pay about one-third of the costs of the educational program (now about \$2 million annually). But Romualdi told me that business contributes only 8.5 per cent and labor 11 per cent; the other fourth-fifths come from AID. (The social projects department of AIFLD also gets the bulk of its money from government agencies, some of it being in the form of guarantees.)

What does AIFLD do? As of its latest report, its fourteen Latin American field offices have trained more than 20,000 students in trade union procedures, and 317 have gone through more advanced courses at 1830 Nineteenth Street in Washington. The latter not only receive travel money and expenses while in the United States but are put on AIFLD's payroll for nine months after they return home. During the general strike in British Guiana this was extended by four or five months, so that the graduates could participate more actively in the attempt to topple the Jagan government.

Both the selection of trainees and the curriculum are designed to stress an anti-Communist position. Communists, of course, are banned; but so, according to Romualdi, is anyone to the left of the Accion Democratica, which rules Venezuela, or the middle-of-the-road Aprista in Peru. Originally, even Christian unionists were excluded. A few Peronistas from Argentina were inducted recently, but they kicked up so much anti-U.S. dust that others are not likely to be enrolled. The kind of people trained can be gauged from AIFLD's reports: "Former AIFLD Students Help Oust Reds from Uruguay Port Union." "Two Institute Graduates

Challenge Communist Control of Honduran Union" Student Hugo Solon Acero of the Confederation of Colombian Workers (CTC), we are told, eliminated "the last vestiges of Communist influence in the regional federation of Cundinamarca." When the government of Joao Goulart was deposed in Brazil, William Doherty, Jr., boasted that AIFLD graduates "were so active that they became intimately involved in some of the clandestine operations of the revolution before it took place. . . . Many of the trade union leaders—some of whom were actually trained in our institute—were involved in the revolution, and in the overthrow of the Goulart regime."

The classes, in addition to instruction in collective bargaining and grievances, include two sessions on the history of U.S. labor, two on the U.S. system of government, one on "totalitarianism," one on communism in Latin America, one on the politics of U.S. labor, one on the Sino-Soviet conflict, and one of the German labor movement. How Latin Americans, armed with this knowledge, can finish their revolution against the atavistic oligarchies is not entirely clear. Romualdi is evidently convinced that it can be accomplished through simple "collective bargaining." Andy McClellan, the AFL-CIO Inter-American representative, who works closely with AIFLD, expresses it well: "Peaceful revolutions can be brought about by a militant democratic trade union movement practicing the collective bargaining procedure."

If education is not enough to keep hemispheric unionists in line, AIFLD has another way to sweeten the carrot. Its social projects department, run by Doherty, armed with tens of millions of U.S. AID dollars and staffed by sixty-seven Americans and thirty locals, allocates large sums for such projects as housing, credit unions, cooperatives, medical clinics, rural development, even union halls. Safe unions south of the border can apply for money either directly from AID's coffers or from AFL-CIO pension funds, guaranteed by AID. Fully one-fourth of AID's housing program of \$250 million will be funneled through Doherty to unionists in Latin America. The most impressive project finished so far is in Mexico City, where a \$10 million loan helped build 3,104 units for members of the Graphic Arts Workers Union. In Honduras, work is being completed on a more modest venture of 185 apartments. Four other projects are on the drawing boards.

According to Doherty's assistant, William A. Douglas: "Until March, 1964, we had only a small program in Brazil. We had no people to work with there. But quite unexpectedly the revolution overthrew Goulart and this changed." The projects department was equipped to act quickly. It cajoled out of AID, among other things, \$150,000 to build five peasant service centers in and near Recife, a focus of peasant hostility.

Someone who worked with AIFLD in Bolivia explained its operations to me this way: "By the definition of AIFLD anyone who wanted a raise was a Communist. Its whole purpose was to make the 120 or so men it trained into government supporters. It was willing to do something for union men only if they would kick the Communists out of their union." By way of example, there existed a good legitimate union in the Bolivian railroad industry. But after AIFLD had trained a small group of railroad workers, the government decided to recognize this new force, led by Sajines Ovando, as the official union. By contrast, the tin miners, Bolivia's largest and most militant union, could expect no help unless they showed an inclination to reduce the work force in the mines and support the now defunct Paz Estenssoro regime.

With AIFLD as its anchor, McClellan running the Inter-American section of the AFL-CIO, and friends in the foreign service who accept the Lovestone doctrine, the AFL-CIO is an instrument for intervention throughout the hemisphere. A dramatic example of unofficial diplomacy at work occurred in the Dominican Republic, where last April Donald Reid Cabral, then head of the ruling junta, conferred the Order of Duarte, Sanchez y Mella on Serafino Romualdi. The AFL-CIO group in the Dominican Republic is an organization called CONATRAL. A few weeks before the first democratically elected President in the country's history was overthrown, CONATRAL ran an ad in the newspapers calling on the people to put their faith in the "armed forces" to defend them against communism. While Ambassador John Bartlow Martin was fervidly supporting Bosch, the U.S. labor attaché, the late Fred A. Somerford, was guiding CONATRAL in anti-Communist diatribes which could only undermine Bosch who was already accused of "softness on communism."

It was an open secret that Somerford, once with the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, disagreed with official policy. An obituary on Somerford states

that a year after Bosch's downfall "George Meany wrote a personal letter of commendation to the deceased for his outstanding contribution to the Democratic Labor Movement of the Dominican Republic." That is the Meany-Lovestone line—to combat any force that is considered "soft"—and the tragedy is that labor movements are so pivotal in revolts and counterrevolts that AFL-CIO strategy can sometimes be enough to tip the scales. It is no accident that Christian trade union forces in Latin America are so hostile to the AFL-CIO and to ORIT. This movement, increasingly revolutionary and independent, suspects anything that smacks of Yankee control. In July, 1964, the Trade Union Bureau of the Christian Democratic Party in Chile ordered its members to quit ORIT and to avoid any collaboration with the AIFLD.

Wherever the Meany-Lovestone influence has injected itself, it has left behind a debris of schism and hostility. Now its attention is turning to Africa. With the recent formation of the African-American Labor Center (AALC) by Irving Brown, a stepped-up campaign on the model of AIFLD is in the making. The object of Brown's attention here is not so much the Communists, who are weak, as it is the neutralists. Since Lovestone considers neutralism an "aide-de-camp" of communism, it is understandable that he should want to contain it and roll it back.

The African labor organizations have therefore been unreceptive to AFL-CIO blandishments. "The Western trade unions," says John K. Tettgah, president of the Ghana Trade Union Congress, "have been treating us patronizingly, attempting to impose on us the way they run their own unions, even forgetting the bloody battles they had to fight to establish their rights. What do the Western trade union bureaucrats know about our struggles for freedom from colonial rule? We resent their condescending attitude." The Africans tend to be revolutionary, Socialist, neutralist in the cold war, and anti-capitalist. They consider the Europeans who control the ICFTU to phlegmatic in fighting colonialism, and neo-colonialism. They consider the AFL-CIO leadership an apologist for American intervention in the Congo.

In 1957, Brown and William Schnitzer, secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO, could report, after a trip to Africa, that African unionists were "looking to the democratic world" for guidance and support. About that time the ICFTU claimed twenty-one affiliates in African territories, with about 25 per cent of organized laborers on the continent. But a year later the number had fallen, according to Ghanaian sources, to 7 percent, ICFTU secretary general, Omer Becu, admits that Western efforts have "not been as successful as we had hoped."

By contrast, Tettgah's All-African Trade Union Federation, formed in 1961, claims adherents in forty-five countries, with about 3 million members. It refuses to affiliate with either ICFTU or the left-wing World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU). Admittedly, AATUF is not particularly active; many of its affiliates are appendages to one-party governments and perform only a minimum of collective bargaining. But the fact is that they want to go their own way, with "guidance" from neither Europe nor America. An article in a Ghana paper charges that the AFL-CIO and the ICFTU "tell African trade unionists to keep their noses out of politics and stick to sound bookkeeping and bread-and-butter issues. The fact is that the era of comparative class peace and conciliation in the metropolitan countries has been bought at the expense of grinding exploitation and bloody repression in the colonies." Americans and Europeans—the article says—are trying to train Africans in the rudiments of collective bargaining and grievance handling, as if they were living in a stable, industrial milieu. But the problems of Africa require national and social revolution, bold changes in social institutions, a spirit of radicalism rather than "class peace."

In this radical, anti-Western setting, Brown's AALC hopes to stimulate workers' education, vocational training, cooperatives, health clinics, housing—much in the style of AIFLD, except that there will be somewhat more emphasis on vocational training (a tailoring institution is now operating in Kenya and there is a school for motor drivers in Nigeria). There are no businessmen on the board of this foundation. The money will come, according to an AALC brochure, from "private and public institutions"; in other words, some from the AFL-CIO most from AID and the United States Government.

The Joint United States Government-labor beneficence, operating on the rigid Lovestone thesis, can result only in divisions within African labor along the same lines as the world itself is divided. The outlines are already visible. Here is an excerpt from the letter of a European unionist who works in the interna-

tional field: "It is a well-known fact that Brown supported a man called Reuben Jamela in Southern Rhodesia who mounted an artificial national center with Brown's money."

And—who knows?—perhaps the AIFLD and AALC model will next be applied to Asia. Lovestone certainly is concerned about developments there. Last year Brown visited Vietnam to cement relations with Tran-Quoc Buu, president of the Vietnamese Confederation of Labor. Buu, a moderate Christian unionist who fled from the Vietminh in the North, was also entertained in the United States under AFL-CIO auspices. The trip by Meany and Lovestone to Japan, for the founding conference of the conservative Japanese Confederation of Labor (Domei) earlier this year, was an obvious attempt to counter the neutralist and leftist tendencies of the predominant labor federation, Sohyo.

American labor leaders certainly have a right to express a preference between foreign unions controlled by Communists or neutralists and those with pro-American sentiments. And it is certainly legitimate for them to offer gifts of cars or mimeograph machines to help the work of those they favor. But there is a line beyond which such aid becomes intervention. What is intolerable is not that Lovestone and company are anti-Communist—virtually all unionists in the United States, including the author, are philosophically opposed to communism. What *is* intolerable is the combative, deliberate attempt to set off one type of foreign unionist against another in order to enhance the United States position in the cold war. What *is* intolerable is the deliberate attempt to mold a foreign union in a barren "anti-Communist" image.

Senator Morse said in a recent criticism of the United States role in international affairs that our government believes "that because of military power its dictates around the world will have to be obeyed." Meany, Lovestone and their adherents believe that because of their dollars—now openly flowing from the U.S. Treasury—unionists abroad can also be made to line up.

Back in 1951, in a brash speech, George Meany listed A.F. of L. accomplishments on the international front. "Primarily due to our effort," he said, "there has been established . . . the Force Ouvrière." In Germany it "was the AFL which broke the Communist stranglehold on the trade unions." "Our European representative, Irving Brown, participated in cleaning the port of Marseilles of Communist control." "We have established numerous contacts with resistance movements" behind the iron curtain. "On the China mainland, we are aiding the underground democratic forces." (Emphasis added in all cases.)

Is it consistent with the principles of a democratic society for a small clique of self-appointed men to inject themselves into the affairs of other nations? Would it be permissible for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to contribute to a Conservative force in England to depose the Labour Party? What gives the AFL-CIO a prerogative that other institutions don't—and shouldn't—have?

[From The New Republic, June 25, 1966]

LOVESTONE'S COLD WAR

THE AFL-CIO HAS ITS OWN CIA

(By Dan Kurzman)

Victor Reuther, director of international affairs for the United Auto Workers, told reporters after a visit to the Dominican Republic that the AFL-CIO was "unfortunately" supporting a "small and unrepresentative group" of Dominican trade unions and ignoring the larger democratic ones. Behind this casual remark simmers a bitter dispute within American labor. AFL-CIO President George Meany and his AFL cohorts support an "anti-Communist" foreign policy that is at least as rigid and narrow as that of the Goldwaterites; UAW President Walter P. Reuther and his followers accent political democracy and social reform abroad rather than negative anti-Communism. Their differences surfaced at the recent AFL-CIO convention in San Francisco when Meany men, to loud objections, demanded a resolution urging the Administration to step up its military activities in Vietnam. It was due only to Reuther's unrelenting resistance that compromise was reached—leaving it all up to Mr. Johnson.

The man who pushed the "Meany resolution" was barely mentioned in news accounts. Jay Lovestone thrives on anonymity. Yet, few non-governmental figures wield so much influence over foreign policy. As director of the AFL-CIO's inter-

national activities, which consume over 20 percent of the federation's \$2 million annual budget. Lovestone is Meany's foreign minister, with his own private network of ambassadors, aid administrators and intelligence agents. Labor attachés in key countries, or their assistants, are often more loyal to him than to their diplomatic superiors. Many of his agents overseas are believed to work closely with the Central Intelligence Agency. Considerable government aid money is channeled through his "ministry"—after he decides who deserves to receive it.

Meany entertains little doubt that Lovestone's guidance is enlightened. For who should know better how to fight Communists than a founder and Secretary-General of the American Communist Party, as well as a founder of the Comintern? Lovestone's attitude to Communism, of whatever variety, is that it must be completely isolated; "peaceful coexistence" is appeasement. Virtually unlimited force should be used to crush Communist "aggression," whether in Vietnam or in the Dominican Republic. There is no real distinction between Soviet and Communist Chinese policies.

To CIO leaders, Lovestone is a man who, in his disillusionment, seeks the expiatory satisfaction of bringing down the pagan temple. He and his followers, they claim, envisage a world split into neatly defined Communist and anti-Communist spheres destined to meet at Armageddon.

Meany-Lovestone policies have bred antagonism not only inside the AFL-CIO but within the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) which comprises many of the non-Communist world's important labor federations. Ironically, Lovestone was one of the leading organizers of the ICFTU, which was formed in 1949 to counter the strength of the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU). Since the death of Stalin in 1954, however, most ICFTU union leaders have gradually moved toward the more accommodating policy of "peaceful coexistence," in line with the sentiments of their governments. In so doing, they have come into sharp conflict with the AFL-CIO leadership. And Meany, enraged by the ICFTU's refusal to approve his policies, shouted to an AFL-CIO executive committee meeting in March, 1965 that the world labor group is an "ineffective bureaucracy right down to the fairies."

Last July, the anti-AFL-CIO feeling found an explosive outlet at an ICFTU meeting in Amsterdam attended by some 300 labor representatives from almost 100 countries. To ringing applause, Louis Major, head of the Belgian Federation of Labor, replied to Meany's taunts, "In an organization such as ours," he said, "should not a large organization have to listen to what others have to say? Instead of pursuing a unilateral policy, should not we all listen to each other's experiences and ideas. . . . Do you not think we have a contribution to make?"

Even usually friendly Canadians got in the act. When Meany became involved in a heated dispute with them over the question of how many seats they should have on the executive board, they charged that he was out to humiliate them because they had not gone along as a "me-too colony." Nor did Meany have the support of even part of his own delegation on some of his proposals. Reuther, for example, voted with the majority against Meany on the relatively minor question of which of two Tunisian delegations should be seated.

AFRO-ASIAN UNIONS

In debates on how to deal with labor in the underdeveloped world, Meany insisted that the ICFTU use its solidarity fund, which is largely contributed by the AFL-CIO, more speedily and efficiently to help build up unions in the Afro-Asian countries. By this he and Lovestone meant the money should be spent to foster anti-Communist sentiments, collective bargaining techniques and union independence from governments. Many European unionists objected. Their own unions are often linked to political parties, so why shouldn't the unions of Africa and Asia have similar links. In fact, they argue, close collaboration between labor, parties and government is desirable in nations seeking swift economic and social development.

The Afro-Asian governments themselves are no longer anxious for the AFL-CIO presence in their countries, though American unionists were more than welcome in the postwar years when the organization supported their independence movements. Now they want to control their domestic unions. Nearly a dozen African unions have withdrawn from the US-dominated ICFTU in recent months and joined a neutralist federation. They haven't forgotten that in 1955 Meany called Jawaharlal Nehru an aide and ally of Communism.

In the hope of doing unilaterally what the ICFTU refuses to do multilaterally, one of Lovestone's top agents, Irving Brown, has set up an African-American

Labor Center (AALC) with US government financial support. Designed to permit retention of an AFL-CIO foothold in Africa, this center has sponsored a tailoring institute in Kenya and a motor drivers' school in Nigeria. It is giving vocational training, planning communities, and building cooperatives and housing. It is also promoting "workers' education."

Many Johnson Administration officials are by no means jubilant about Lovestone's thesis that cold war tensions must not be relaxed unless the Communists agree to such unlikely concessions as the reunification of Germany on US terms, or the tearing down of the Berlin wall. Those government officials who wish to further "peaceful coexistence" with the Soviet Union and to build "bridges" to Eastern Europe through increased trade and cultural relations, did not appreciate, for example, AFL-CIO support of longshoremen who recently refused to load wheat intended for Russia.

Nevertheless, as one high US official told me, "labor is more a factor in the conduct of our foreign policy than anyone might have dreamed was possible a few years ago." (As already indicated, with his network of agents on both sides of the Iron Curtain, Lovestone is believed to be cooperating closely with the CIA, though he denies it. He maintains that, as a good American, he would naturally supply his government with information he might receive bearing on the national security.) So valuable is Lovestone regarded that the appointment of labor attachés in many embassies, including such key posts as London, Paris, Rome and Brussels, usually must receive his approval, according to responsible US labor sources. If the attaché is not a "Lovestone man," his assistant often is, and he realizes that the quickest way to advancement is to keep Lovestone posted on his superior's activities. A former labor attaché in a Latin American embassy said that he had refrained from meeting with local labor leaders not acceptable to the AFL-CIO for fear that Lovestone might find out.

In one recent case, an official in our embassy in Belgrade reported to Lovestone that an AFL-CIO employee was visiting Yugoslavia. On returning to Washington, the traveler, who was trying to get a job as a labor attaché, found that he had to explain to Lovestone why he went to Yugoslavia (he went as a tourist) and what his political views were.

Lovestone's critics in the AFL-CIO, the Labor Department and other government and non-government agencies are reluctant to speak a word against him, as I discovered, except in out-of-the-way restaurants and bars. Some used aliases when telephoning information. "I'd be branded as a Communist and lose my job if it were known that I spoke against Jay," one explained.

After a series of articles I wrote on Lovestone's international operations appeared in *The Washington Post*, Lovestone persuaded Labor Department officials and Leonard Marks, director of the United States Information Agency, to cancel plans for distributing the articles to US missions abroad.

SOMETHING OF A MYSTERY

Lovestone's remarkable achievement in moving from the leadership of the American Communist Party to an informal position of power within the policy-making structure of the US reflects his extraordinary drive, resilience and political skill. A tough but distinguished-looking man with white hair and a large nose, Lovestone, despite his 67 years, often works up to 18 hours a day in his apartment in New York or in Washington.

Migrating with his parents from Lithuania at the age of 10, Lovestone graduated from the College of the City of New York. He spent the following years studying law and accountancy and working as a druggist, statistician, envelope-maker and social worker. Having joined the Socialist Party while still in college, he helped to split off the party's left wing and reorganize it into a Communist Party in 1919. He edited the official party newspaper, *The Communist*, and gradually worked his way to the top.

Even in the conspiratorial atmosphere of Bolshevik politics, he was, as he is now, regarded as something of a mystery. Benjamin Gitlow, who also defected eventually from the Communist Party, writes in his book, *I Confess*, that "not a man in the party knew anything more about him" than that he was unmarried. He was "a veritable Tammany chieftain among us Communists," Gitlow writes. "One of his most successful methods was to call a comrade into his office, tell him extremely confidential information, obtaining in return a solemn promise that the matter would not be disclosed to a soul. In that way he won the support of numerous party members, who believed they were particularly favored by him. . . . He sold [Communism] with particular success to ambitious intellectuals, espe-

cially the naive and the uninitiated, with the persistence of a Fuller brush salesman. . . . Lovestone seldom failed. Inside the party he high-hatted no one. He could stoop to the plane of the most backward party member."

After becoming Secretary-General, Lovestone, as a leader of the Comintern, went to its 1928 congress and supported Nikolai Bukharin in his struggle for power with Stalin. "I was not only a personal friend of Bukharin," Lovestone told the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1939, "but I had fundamental agreement with him on international questions, though on Russian questions I had agreement with Stalin and not with him."

In 1929, Lovestone confidently went to Moscow to plead his case after winning a 90-percent majority in a party election. "I had an illusion in which I was wrong—that I could change them, or convince them . . . not to declare war on us," Lovestone explained a decade later to the House committee. But the illusion was soon dispelled. Lovestone and other American Communist leaders were charged with promoting party factionalism and "exceptionalism," the doctrine that under special circumstances it is possible to diverge from the party line. On his return home, Lovestone found himself an outcast from the party on Stalin's orders. He did not abandon Communism, but established an opposition Communist Party whose members became known as Lovestones. Finally, giving up on Stalin, Lovestone converted his group in 1936 into the Independent Labor League of America. A pamphlet he wrote called for the "establishment in the transition period between the capitalist and socialist societies of a workers' state—a dictatorship of, by, and for the workers, but free from the errors and terrors of Stalinism."

"Capitalism," Lovestone thought, "has succeeded in destroying almost all vestiges of freedom." He opposed "any war conducted by a capitalist government in Washington because such a war can be only reactionary and for imperialist ends."

But the Lovestonites bitterly fought the Stalists in the labor unions in the late 1930's, supporting in this effort President Homer Martin of the United Auto Workers and David Dubinsky of the Ladies' Garment Workers' Union—ironically, since Lovestone had tried earlier to destroy Dubinsky's leadership.

In 1940, Lovestone disbanded his organization, gave up Marxism, and threw himself into the struggle against Hitler, taking a job as head of the labor committee of the American Committee to Defend America.

Dubinsky, fearful that the Communists would grab control of the world free trade union movement after the war, selected Lovestone to direct his trouble-shooting international relations department. Subsequently, Lovestone took on a second anti-Communist job, Executive Secretary of the Free Trade Union Committee, established by Dubinsky, AFL President William Green, Meany (then Secretary-Treasurer), and other labor leaders.

During the postwar years, Lovestone played a vital role in meeting Stalinist thrusts. His principal agent was and is Irving Brown. The two had met in 1932 at a socialist club meeting at New York University, and four years later Lovestone got Brown a job with the UAW. In 1945, he sent Brown to Europe on a trouble-shooting assignment. Brown stayed for 17 years.

Supplying European unions with money, typewriters and technical help, Brown managed to split some labor groups away from Communist-dominated labor federations in France and Italy. Though some critics say this simply gave the Communists complete control of the largest federations in these countries, it apparently prevented the success of general strikes that threatened to paralyze the Marshall Plan. Brown also financed and organized strong-arm squads to thwart Communist efforts to keep French stevedores from unloading ships carrying Marshall Plan goods.

Elsewhere, too, Lovestone's agents were active after the war, Harry Goldberg, an old Lovestonite, promoted free labor movements in India, Indonesia and Italy. Carmel Offi worked in the State Department, Benjamin Mandel for congressional security committees.

While the AFL was thus fighting Communism abroad, the CIO found itself in a dilemma. It had helped form the World Federation of Trade Unions, which included Communist unions. But, as the AFL had warned, the Communists came to dominate the organization, and in 1948, the CIO finally withdrew and joined the AFL in forming the ICFU.

LATIN AMERICAN AGENTS

In Lovestone's vast international labor empire, no area gets more attention, advice, money and intelligence agents today than Latin America. Here, Lovestone works through two instruments. One is the Inter-American Regional Labor Organization (ORIT)—the Latin branch of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU)—which he and his agents dominate much as the U.S. government dominates the Organization of American States (OAS). The second instrument is the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), which has its U.S. government counterpart in the Agency for International Development (AID). The announced functions of this latter organization are to train Latin workers in democratic unionism and to provide housing, banks and other institutions for them. But many U.S. and Latin American labor officials view as one of the principal functions of both ORIT and AIFLD one that is unannounced—support of Central Intelligence Agency operations.

The willingness of ORIT members to accept almost all AFL-CIO recommendations, however reluctantly at times, is a welcome relief to Lovestone after the rebelliousness of some other ICFTU members. Nor is ORIT's work without merit. It teaches Latin labor leaders the essentials of democratic unionism at regional seminars, at a school in Mexico City, and through cooperation with outside educational institutions.

ORIT-trained pupils have won control of some unions that had been dominated by Communists and reduced Communist influence in others. Such leaders recently wrested from the Communists Honduras' Central Federation of Labor and Standard Fruit Company workers, Uruguay's port workers, and key El Salvadorian unions. In British Guiana, AFL-CIO advisers and funds helped in 1964 to derail a strike called by former Prime Minister Cheddi Jagan to force replacement of a democratic ORIT sugar workers' union with one that Jagan controlled as the sole union bargaining agent.

Like the U.S. government, however, the AFL-CIO is reluctant to promote genuinely profound social change for fear that the Communists will turn a revolutionary situation to their advantage. It is a policy, naturally, that lends itself to the support of dictatorships in the name of anti-Communism, so long as the AFL-CIO is given a free hand in the "guidance" of local unions. Thus, the U.S. labor federation has cooperated with "military dictatorships" in Honduras and Guatemala, where AFL-CIO activities are welcomed, but has snubbed what are referred to as "totalitarian dictatorships," such as Haiti, Paraguay and Spain, because these governments wish to monopolize control of their unions. The AFL-CIO has even indicated a preference for the forcible ouster of a constitutional government, if such a regime does not cooperate with it and the forces ousting it do. The AFL-CIO backed the military in last year's Dominican revolution, the goal of which was to bring Bosch back from exile to the presidency. Lovestone thought that the U.S. had erred in sending the Marines to put down the Dominican revolution, rather than sending soldiers. Marines, he reasoned, have a bad reputation in Latin America for doing in the past exactly what they did last year. Otherwise, however, he staunchly supported the intervention.

The AFL-CIO's support of dictatorial regimes has a long, and sometimes ironic, history. When Col. Carlos Castillo Armas challenged the Guatemalan government of President Jacobo Arbenz, AFL-CIO representatives exerted enormous pressure on Latin American members of ORIT to pass a resolution endorsing Castillo Armas by name. The Latins finally agreed, though they did not want to go on record as backing Castillo Armas, who had dictatorial ambitions himself. Subsequently, the Americans were embarrassed when the victorious Castillo Armas suppressed the union movement and would not cooperate with the AFL-CIO.

In the 1964 Brazilian revolution, Lovestone and ORIT, like the U.S. government, threw their weight behind the new military regime immediately after it took office, and while it was arresting thousands of people and eliminating the political rights of others. The new Brazilian leaders, an AFL-CIO official explained, had promised to reform Brazil's labor system under which the government had long controlled the unions. But it soon became apparent that these leaders had little intention of changing this system.

"How did we know that we'd be double-crossed?" an AFL-CIO official lamented.

The AFL-CIO also backed the Cuban Confederation of Labor (CTC) during the regime of Fulgencio Batista, though this organization was one of the dic-

tator's principal pillars of support. The CTC, when confronted with an ORIT resolution denouncing Batista and the CTC, found the AFL-CIO a loyal friend. Though faced with massive resistance, the American federation managed to eliminate from the resolution any condemnation of the CTC. As Latin pressure on the AFL-CIO increased and Batista's position weakened, Lovestone, in March, 1958, secretly sent Serafino Romualdi, then the AFL-CIO delegate to ORIT, to Havana to feel out rebel Fidel Castro on a "deal." Romualdi got CTC Secretary-General Eusebio Mujal to contact Castro and offer him the CTC's support if he would agree to let it retain its freedom and presumably the AFL-CIO's tutorship. Castro ignored the offer, and when he took power, the CTC leaders fled and new democratic union leaders emerged. They cut relations with the AFL-CIO for having supported a Batista-controlled apparatus. In the view of some observers, Cuban labor might have been able to resist eventual domination by Castro, and possibly thwarted his betrayal of the Cuban revolution, if the democratic leaders had had AFL-CIO support.

Not surprisingly, former CTC leaders who had worked with Batista—and are suspected of having CIA connections—were soon attached to organizations backed by the AFL-CIO: Eusebio Mujal as head of the Central Cuban Workers in Exile in Mexico; José Artigas Carbonel, former CTC treasurer, as representative of the AIFLD in Central America; and Esteban Rustan, former Secretary-General of the Confederation of Bank Employees, as ORIT man in Costa Rica.

Lovestone's chief agent in Latin America is Andrew McLellan, editor of the *Inter-American Labor Bulletin* and the AFL-CIO delegate to ORIT. McLellan enjoys more independence than other Lovestone agents. His quick rise to his present important position despite a limited trade union background is regarded by some AFL-CIO colleagues as more the result of ties with certain government agencies than of his labor experience. As tough as he looks, McLellan reports that in early 1963 "we actually had to fight the Communists in the streets" of Santo Domingo. Young rioters armed with bicycle chains took over the main shopping center of the city and threatened to smash the windows of any shops that opened. With McLellan's encouragement, "the port workers brought their hooks, which had a powerful psychological effect." A mob paraded with a casket bearing McLellan's name, but the streets were soon cleared.

PARALLEL OPERATIONS

To some degree, recent close coordination between his operation and the State Department's in Latin America can be attributed to McLellan's long friendship with Thomas C. Mann, until recently Undersecretary of State for Economic Affairs. Mann is a native of Laredo, Texas. McLellan lived nearby and says he knew the Mann family. The two men worked together in El Salvador in the mid-1950's, Mann as Ambassador and McLellan as ORIT representative in Central America. They found much in common.

Hardly had Mann taken over as Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs under President Johnson than he invited McLellan and Lovestone to speak to his staff. Lovestone did most of the talking, vigorously taking issue, incidentally, with the thesis of Walt Rostow, then State's Policy Planning Council Chairman, that differences between the Soviet Union and Communist China are meaningful.

One indication of the regard in which the State Department has held Lovestone and McLellan was an effort to insert AFL-CIO influence in matters concerning the Organization of American States. This happened late in 1964 when OAS officials asked a finance committee to support the training of Latin American workers in development planning. The US representative suggested that they consult first with McLellan to make sure the program would not interfere with the AFL-CIO's activities. The officials reluctantly agreed to do so, and over lunch McLellan, after sharply questioning them, agreed to the plan. He suggested that they meet with him for regular consultations, but the officials, already nettled, saw no reason why they should consult with a private organization.

The close rapport between the AFL-CIO and the US government in their parallel Latin American operations, particularly their common "pragmatic" attitude toward political and social development, has hardly turned ORIT into a popular champion of Latin labor. US and Latin critics say that ORIT today, though embracing six million of Latin America's estimated 15 million organized workers, has little real vitality and is regarded with disdain by many workers, including a large number within the organization itself. What mainly holds ORIT to-

gether, say these critics, is the willingness of the AFL-CIO, as in Europe and elsewhere, to pay cooperative union leaders well for their services—from what appears to be an inexhaustible kitty.

Lovestone and ORIT have also benefited from a scarcity of competition. Fidel Castro failed in one effort to set up a Communist-controlled rival confederation, though he may have better success with a new one that is designed for greater appeal to non-Communist workers. About two million workers, including the Cubans, now belong to Communist-dominated unions.

More popular, and perhaps the labor organization of the future, is the Latin American Confederation of Christian Trade Unions (CLASC), which attacks ORIT as a tool of US "imperialism." McLellan has replied that it is hard to view CLASC as non-Communist. Various attempts at reconciliation have failed. CLASC demands immediate social revolution, apparently including the use of force when necessary. It reflects the nationalism and the fear of American-style free enterprise that many Latin Americans feel. In short, it is a Latin-dominated and not a US-dominated organization.

FOOTWORK IN GUYANA

In the face of such threats, Lovestone is counting on the AIFLD to help keep Latin labor in line behind his, or at least CIA, policies. As it is a strictly US organization, he can use AIFLD more openly for this purpose than he can the multilateral ORIT. The AIFLD is a non-profit institute administered by the AFL-CIO, but backed as well by 60 US business firms and the US government, which finances or guarantees about 80 percent of its program.

This program, since inauguration of the Institute in 1962, has produced about 400 graduates in democratic labor education from a training school in Washington, and some 2,000 graduates of schools in over a dozen Latin American countries. It has sponsored construction of a \$10 million workers' housing project in Mexico, embracing 3,100 units, and several hundred houses in Honduras. It has established a Workers' Housing Bank in Peru and provided over \$60,000 for "impact" projects, including food distribution and laundry cooperatives. In mid-May, urgent telephone calls from State Department officials to Meany elicited an AIFLD commitment of \$2 million for the building of over 500 houses in the newly independent nation of Guyana to get the US off on the right foot in that country.

Nevertheless, the AIFLD has made enemies in Latin America. The Costa Rican press recently castigated the Institute for trying to impose what it called unjust conditions for participation in a proposed \$1.2 million housing program. It particularly criticized AIFLD insistence that the Institute determine which individuals will get the houses, feeling that they should not be distributed as possible offerings to "cooperative" labor leaders. Nor did the Costa Ricans hide their fury about a stipulation that they hire US rather than local engineers to design the houses.

In Argentina, labor leaders have all but given up on a \$10 million AIFLD housing project promised their workers in April, 1964. The first house has yet to be built. In the Dominican Republic, a US technician supervising an AIFLD housing project wrote AID officials that "the major defect in the planning of the project is that it was obviously designed to impress the USA with the tremendous impact of the AIFLD rather than serve the practical necessities of the Dominican Republic and Dominican labor."

The Institute's labor training program, in particular the policy of paying graduates almost a year's salary after they finish their course, has also drawn fire. How can such a labor leader go back to his union and run it independently, they ask? Nor is the image of "independence" enhanced, they say, when Lovestone and his agents boast that their pupils have participated in the overthrow of governments, however undesirable. Such a boast was publicly made, for example, following the ouster of Brazilian President Joao Goulart in 1964.

No less intolerable to the critics is the make up of AIFLD's board of directors, which includes many big businessmen such as Board Chairman J. Peter Grace, who is not reputed for his friendly attitude toward labor. According to Lovestone and Doherty, their presence on the board offers an example to Latin American workers how capital and labor can cooperate.

In short, say the critics, though very quietly, the principal purpose of the AIFLD is not to build houses or to promote democracy, but to help the CIA

gather intelligence and manipulate political forces. At least some persons working for the Institute are known to have been asked to cooperate with the CIA. They are told, one informant said, that "Latin America's social revolution must be diverted into proper channels." "Proper" means acceptable to Jay Lovestone.

"The tragedy is," one US labor authority said, "that the AFL-CIO, which has done so much to promote social reform in the country, is afraid to do as much for workers abroad for fear that too much change will play into the hands of the Communists. As a result, it has allied itself with the forces most disinterested, or opposed to, change—rightist dictators, espionage groups, corrupt labor leaders, and feudalistic politicians—the very people on whom the Communists are depending for ultimate victory."

[From *The Commonweal*, Mar. 21, 1969]

LABOR'S ESTABLISHMENT—STOP THE WORLD

When the aging president-emeritus of the Garment Workers, David Dubinsky, voted "present" on the question before the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO at one of its concluding morning sessions at Bal Harbour, Florida, last month, he might well have experienced one of those flashbacks into his career—one which contains myriad interlocking roles in the history of American labor, social democracy and left-wing political fratricide.

The question involved concurrence with the recommendations of the AFL-CIO's Department of International Relations, headed by Jay Lovestone, which called for total and unconditional withdrawal by the American labor body from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. Accompanying the call for concurrence without dissent was a vituperative attack by George Meany on the world labor organization, which claims 64 million affiliate members in 94 non-Communist countries.

Only goateed Jack Potofsky of the Clothing Workers abstained. As always, George Meany got what he wanted without a dissenting vote, and by virtual fiat the spokesmen for the mainstream of American labor announced that they had decided to stop the world so they could get off. Almost incredibly, at a time when even the administration of Richard Nixon had declared that it was ready to end the era of confrontation to begin the era of negotiations, an important sector of the liberal democratic community in the United States declared itself for an unreconstructed and strident anti-Communism.

Dubinsky, knowing all this, must have reflected upon the ironic twists of history, for in many ways it was he, Meany and Lovestone who created the ICFTU 20 years previous as a vehicle of fighting Communism in the trade unions at home and abroad—as well as being a valuable instrument of Marshall Plan foreign policy. More ironic, perhaps, was the other undisputed footnote in labor history—that the Garment Workers' chief more than any other person was responsible for the success and present influence of both Meany and Lovestone.

Few would have thought that when Dubinsky brought them together in 1941 two men with such outwardly clashing backgrounds would within three decades come to hold virtual veto power over important aspects of American domestic and foreign policy. Meany epitomized the "responsible" trade union leader: a strong advocate of the virtues of free enterprise, pragmatic, honest, staunch and an uncompromising anti-Communist, cigar-chewing and a man to put at ease any meeting of employers with his famous declaration that he had never personally been in a strike or walked a picket line (a boast he could still make 28 years later). He was recognized as a real comer among union executives.

Lovestone, on the other hand, had only recently emerged from the subterranean labyrinth of American Communism and radicalism between the two World Wars. There was a time, just prior to the 1929 crash, when he had actually been the head of the C.P. in the United States. He participated in the intrigue and character assassinations that were common to the Trotsky-Stalin warfare within international Communism, and in a harrowing experience which might have been written by Ian Fleming. Lovestone was forcibly held in Moscow while Comintern agents proceed to destroy his following of American C.P. cadres, and he was accordingly excommunicated from both leadership and membership. Undaunted, he formed his own Communist party in opposition and with other

familiar names who were to make careers of their ex-Communism, such as Benjamin Gitlow, Bertram Mandel and Bertram Wolfe, continued to hold meetings and issue manifestos in the telephone booths of New York, Chicago and Detroit for the next decade.

When Dubinsky discovered Lovestone, there was a market for informed veterans of the left who knew the tactics and ideology of fighting the left, both Communist and non-Communist. The unlikely joining of the careers of Meany and Lovestone, who by then had become head of the Garment Workers' international affairs department, was consummated. From that time, the doctrine of anti-Communism and the foreign posture of the American Federation of Labor became one and the same. With little difficulty it became also the policy of the merged AFL-CIO after 1955. Jay Lovestone, who all through these years remained as the single most important consular to Meany, retained the enigmatic role he had played both within and without mainline American Communism, participating in top-level decisions, always present yet rarely seen or photographed. Interestingly enough, there is no record of his public repudiation of Communism or his embracing Meany's thing—partnership capitalism between government, business and labor.

In 1949 the Soviet presence in Europe was a real threat to not only the post-war governments of the West, but the non-Communist trade unions of France and Italy. General strikes and the prospect of a revival of the Popular Front in France alarmed the U.S. It was a time for cold warfare and matching the Communists at their own game, and so enters—Jay Lovestone, of course.

Thomas W. Braden, then Allen Dulles' deputy director in the Central Intelligence Agency, would later write that Lovestone had "an enormous grasp of foreign intelligence operations." His account of the French counterstroke using American labor would set the pace for a decade and a half of later involvement abroad by the AFL-CIO: "... into the crisis stepped Lovestone and his assistant Irving Brown. With funds from Dubinsky's union, they organized the *Force Ouvrier*, a non-Communist union. When they ran out of money, they appealed to the CIA. Thus began the secret subsidy of free trade unions which soon spread to Italy."

Braden, who "told all" in the wake of the 1967 disclosures of CIA involvement in funding American student, labor and cultural fronts abroad, recalled candidly that Brown passed CIA money "to pay off the strong-arm squads in Mediterranean ports" breaking Communist-led strikes. The formation of the ICTFU in November, 1949, in London was the result of several years of involvement by Lovestone and Brown in Europe, directed by Meany and largely funded by Dubinsky. It was the "free world" answer to the Soviet-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions, which the CIO had left the year before.

In building a strong, non-Communist free trade union movement, however, it was inevitable that dependence upon American leadership and American money would diminish; the emergency assistance to unions in the Marshall Plan era was acceptable to European labor leaders, but the continued presence of people like Brown, whose CIA associations were acknowledged, became a sensitive issue, and one of political liability to those unions who did not speak out against clandestine operations. This, coupled with the Meany support of America's military adventure in Asia, further alienated the ICTFU member nations in Europe from the AFL-CIO. In 1965 Meany openly expressed his displeasure over the Confederation's lack of enthusiasm for the cold war, urging it to return to the old "major task (of) fighting Communism." Later, when the ICTFU declined to support the American involvement in Vietnam, the AFL-CIO chief responded by declaring that its Brussels Secretariat was infiltrated "by a bunch of homosexuals."

Walter Reuther and the UAW became a convenient strawman for breaking the Confederation knot. Meany alleged that the ICTFU had been guilty of "shabby treatment," but actually the international organization had turned back to the UAW bid for affiliation in an effort toward reconciliation. The withdrawal was inevitable, in keeping with the 1966 boycott of the International Labor Organization because a Polish representative had been elected chairman, and the McCarthyite denunciation of the small anti-war faction within the AFL-CIO (Meany charged a meeting of labor doves had been "planned in Hanoi," despite the fact that most of its organization and support had been by Potofsky's Clothing Workers).

The extent of alienation between the AFL-CIO and the "free world" labor camp was reflected in an exchange among the German Metalworkers federation leadership and Meyer Bernstein, the Steelworkers' International Affairs head, who urged their support for the war in Vietnam and in the process observed that his members were participating in a program which "sends thousands of dollars of chocolate milk to South Vietnamese children." The Germans responded negatively, pointing out that "chocolate milk and napalm do not mix."

In pragmatic terms of its own goals and objectives, the AFL-CIO no longer needs the ICFTU. It has a far-flung network of labor fronts which it directly controls and which are also funded by the government and in some instances by industry. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee disclosed last year that the American Institute for Free Labor Development—run out of a highly-guarded Fort Royal, Virginia complex—obtained over \$20-million from the U.S. Agency for International Development since 1962. AIFLD has boasted of its involvement in the military coup in Brazil in 1964, and its role in Guiana politics. AIFLD supports American presence in the Dominican Republic and can always be counted upon to support the rivals of non-Communist but anti-American trade unions. The African-American Labor Center, which received \$2.5-million in AID funds during 1967 and 1968 alone, is headed by Irving Brown, which should speak enough of its involvement in the shadow-land surrounding the rise and fall of governments in post-colonial Africa. Finally, the brand-new Asian-American Free Labor Institute has set up shop in Saigon, concerned with the free trade union movement in those free-world Asian outposts of South Vietnam, South Korea, Formosa and Thailand.

Forty years ago Jay Lovestone, locked behind the Kremlin walls, was a short-lived pawn of the Comintern strategy in dominating foreign Communist parties. Today he resides in the power center of American labor, directing policies throughout the world and effecting decisions which have led not only to the almost total isolation of labor in the United States but in all probability the return of most of the non-Communist labor movement abroad into the Soviet influence orbit. As with the late John Foster Dulles—with enemies like these, why should the Russians need friends?

JOSEPH HILL

(Joseph Hill is a pseudonym for a journalist specializing in labor affairs.)

The CHAIRMAN. I believe this could go on endlessly, but I hope, Mr. Meany, you will not be too offended that I do not agree with you in the same sense that you don't agree with me. I have realized for a number of years that our views about foreign policy have been directly in conflict, and that is your privilege.

As Mark Twain says that is what makes a horse race. It wouldn't be too bad if we all thought the same thing but it is my responsibility to try to keep our activities from being against our public interest and that is the question at issue. I think this exposition of your views and of the committee's will, hopefully, add something to the clarification of the case. When you said you weren't here to ask for funds for the AIFLD that did surprise me a bit. I thought that was part of your reason to be here.

Mr. MEANY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, do you have anything further to say?

Mr. MEANY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. MEANY. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 1:30 p.m., the committee was adjourned.)



